



7
John G. Jacob
A CHARGE,

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY AND CHURCHWARDENS
OF THE DIOCESE OF NEWCASTLE,

AT HIS PRIMARY VISITATION,

MAY 30TH, 31ST, JUNE 1ST, 2ND, 1899.

TOGETHER WITH

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED AT

HIS PRIMARY VISITATION OF S. NICHOLAS' CATHEDRAL,
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE,

JUNE 6TH, 1899.

BY

EDGAR JACOB, D.D.,

BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE :
MAWSON, SWAN, & MORGAN.

—
LONDON :
PARKER & CO.

CONTENTS OF CHARGE.

I. NEWCASTLE.

DIOCESAN PROGRESS AND NEEDS.

	PAGES.
INTRODUCTION. NATURE OF DIOCESE. DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS BODIES - - - -	1
LOSSES IN CLERGY AND LAITY SINCE 1896 -	4
ROLL OF CLERGY. ORDINATIONS - - -	5
CONFIRMATION STATISTICS. PREPARATION FOR CONFIRMATION - - - - -	6
BAPTISM. SPONSORSHIP. RESOLUTIONS OF LAMBETH CONFERENCE - - - - -	8
SPIRITUAL WORK OF THE LAITY. ILLUSTRATIONS. DIOCESAN LAY HELPERS' ASSOCIATION - -	13
PAROCHIAL BUILDINGS AND MISSION HALLS. THEIR NEED AND USE - - - - -	16
INCREASED POPULATION ON TYNESIDE. NEW PARISHES. LARGE PARISHES WITH ASSOCIATED CLERGY -	17
EXCHANGE OF PATRONAGE WITH THE CROWN -	19
DIOCESAN SOCIETY. BISHOPS' ADDITIONAL CLERGY FUND. CHAPLAIN TO DEAF AND DUMB. CENTRAL SOCIETIES - - - -	20
SLENDER INCOMES OF CLERGY. QUEEN VICTORIA. CLERGY SUSTENTATION FUND. CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION - - - - -	20
DIOCESAN HOMES. HOUSE OF MERCY. HOMES FOR WAIFS AND STRAYS - - - -	21

II. HEXHAM.

THE UNREST IN THE CHURCH.

	PAGES.
<p> FOUNDATIONS FOR CONFIDENCE </p>	22
<p> 1. Drawing together of Men of Different Schools, and assistance privately given to the Bishops as compared with thirty years ago </p>	23
<p> 2. Growing position of the Laity. Effect of this </p>	24
<p> CAUSES OF UNEASINESS </p>	25
<p> (i.) Additional and unauthorised Services To be met by appeals to Episcopal authority and common sense. How far this charge affects the Diocese. </p>	26
<p> (ii.) Alteration in Prayer Book Services, or Violations of Directions How far this charge affects the Diocese. Judgment in case, Read v. Bishop of Lincoln </p>	27
<p> (iii.) Questions of Doctrine </p>	30
<p> (a.) Confession </p>	30
<p> (b.) Doctrine of Holy Communion </p>	35
<p> (c.) Prayers for the dead </p>	39
<p> FAR GREATER IMPORTANCE OF MATTERS IN WHICH CHRISTIAN MEN ARE AGREED </p>	41
<p> IMPORTANCE OF TIME. REPRESSION BY LAW, A BAD REMEDY, THE LAST TO WHICH RECOURSE SHOULD BE HAD </p>	41

III. MORPETH.

THE CHURCH IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATE.

	PAGES.
UNBROKEN CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH FROM THE FIRST - - - - -	42
CHURCH BROUGHT INTO CONTACT WITH THE STATE IN RESPECT OF—	
(i.) CLERGY - - - - -	43
(a.) Patronage. Benefices Act, 1898 -	44
Presentation is to the Bishop who confers cure of souls.	
(b.) Legal Status of Incumbent. Rector. Vicar. Perpetual Curate - - -	45
Memorandum by Chancellor. Some unintentional irregularities -	45
Vicars of "New parishes" not "instituted" but "licensed and admitted" -	48
(c.) Parsonages. Dilapidations -	49
(d.) Clergy Discipline, as affected by Acts of 1892 and 1898 - - - - -	50
Questions of ritual and doctrine -	50
(ii.) CHURCHES. Insurance. Faculties. Laws of Health - - - - -	51
(iii.) THE LAITY. (a.) Education. - - -	53
(b.) Marriage - - - - -	55
(c.) Burial Laws - - - - -	56
(iv.) SPIRITUAL AUTONOMY - - - - -	58
The Laity in Council.	
Need of Patience. What each may do.	

IV. ALNWICK.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

	PAGES.
STAGES OF CHURCH EXTENSION	62
(i.) Lives of the Clergy	62
(ii.) The inner circle in every parish	63
(iii.) Church of England principles	64
(iv.) The masses outside religion. How to be won	66
Christianity taught, lived, applied	68
Ethical Extension of the Kingdom.	
(v.) Responsibility for the entire Church	69
(vi.) Foreign Missions	69
Gradual expansion of Soul	70
Missionary Centenaries and Bicentenaries	73
Day of Intercession	74
Lambeth Conference Report and Resolutions	74
CONCLUSION	77

CHARGE AT THE VISITATION OF THE CATHEDRAL.

JUNE 6TH, 1899.

FIRST VISITATION OF S. NICHOLAS CATHEDRAL:

PAGES.

1. Archbishop Benson's Picture of Lincoln Cathedral in old days. 52 Prebendaries. No line between great and small Chapters. Legists as well as theologians and preachers. Schools of Architecture, Music, Grammar, and Divinity. The Senate of the Diocese 79
2. The Bishop's duty in Visitation which went on till 1724 when lethargy came over the Church - - - - - 81
3. Revival of Cathedral life. The conciliar idea prominent - - - - - 82
4. Newcastle Chapter Act and its provision. Near completion of Canonry to be attached to Vicarage of Newcastle. Munificence of Mr. Thomas Spencer. Appeal to complete these two Stalls - - - - - 83
5. Functions of Canons - - - - - 85
6. Proposal to amend the Chapter Act, 1884, and to detach Eglington from Archdeacons of Lindisfarne - - - - - 89
7. Importance of Cathedral system. Canons. Clergy. Churchwardens. Organist. Choir. Vergers - - - - - 89

CHARGE,

DELIVERED IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF S. NICHOLAS,
ON THE 30TH DAY OF MAY, 1899.

I.—DIOCESAN PROGRESS AND NEEDS.

MY BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY AND LAITY :

A visitation is a very solemn gathering together of clergy and churchwardens, with a legal and a spiritual aspect. Legally, it is a court at which churchwardens are admitted to office, and presentments, if needed, made. Spiritually, it is an occasion for prayer and intercession, exhortation and conference. We meet together to consider what progress we have made, as a Diocese, and as a part of a still larger body, the Church of Christ planted in this land, to review the past, to acknowledge our shortcomings, to thank God for the many tokens of His Blessing, and to see in what ways we may be the better prepared to respond to the call that is made upon the Church in times of trial. To me at any rate, a Primary visitation is a very special care. Three years and a half are all too short a time for a thorough knowledge of all our needs and circumstances, and yet I must not hesitate to speak to you frankly my mind on matters which are our common concern. I shall not easily forget the cordial welcome given to me by clergy and laity of the Diocese on my coming, as a Southerner, to live amongst you in the most Northern Diocese of England early in 1896. Nor can I forget to acknowledge the unwearied labours of my predecessor, the first Bishop of this See, and of those, both clergy and laity,—among whom I may without invidiousness

•

specially mention the late Vicar of Newcastle, now Bishop of Thetford,—to whom the admirable organisation which I found in this Diocese are due. It has been mine, not primarily to construct or re-construct, but to develop. The lines of Diocesan organisation were well and soundly laid. Modification and development, indeed, are needed in the progress of all human Society, but I have found nothing which I have not thankfully received, and which I desired constitutionally to change. There has been, and I thank God for it, cordial co-operation between clergy and laity in promoting the good of the Diocese through all these three and a half years. We have worked together without a tinge of party spirit for the advancement of the Diocese as a whole, and the sorrow and the sickness, which fell to the lot of me and mine last year, only served to emphasize the sympathy which has marked our common work, and to elicit its expression.

The Diocese is one which from its history, its position and its circumstances, may well inspire a man who is entrusted with its oversight. An ordination on Sunday last in a Parish Church (Berwick-upon-Tweed), built during the Commonwealth, opened in the presence of Oliver Cromwell, and within sight of the Holy Island which was the chief scene of the labours of the first apostle to Northern England, S. Aidan, distant but comparatively few miles from the scene of the bloodiest battle between English and Scots, helps to remind us of the strange vicissitudes that are part of the history of Northumberland. What scenes of Saxon Christianity can rival Lindisfarne and Hexham? What proof of Danish ravage can exceed the witness of the remains in Holy Island to-day? What would we not give to have not only Saxon Towers on the Tyne, but the real remains of the Saxon architecture on Holy Island, rather than simply those of a Norman or later date? What proof of Roman

occupation can exceed in interest the Roman wall, and the crypt of Hexham Abbey? Every style of English architecture is to be found among us, while some Churches bear traces not only of various styles but of the border wars which characterised our early history, and sometimes destroyed a Church twice in a single century.

But the Newcastle and Northumberland of to-day have features of their own. Our neighbourhood to Scotland means not warfare but the friendly contact of hard-headed educated men of every grade, and the efforts of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism side by side for the common good. I venture to say that the fact is significant, for in no other English diocese is it so marked. It gives us the opportunity of striving worthily to represent the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England without compromise of principle, but with the frankest recognition of the Christian labours of others who worship God in ways as dear and sacred to them as ours to us. I desire personally to acknowledge the cordiality with which I have been always met by Presbyterians, and I venture to think that with respect to them and to other bodies of Christians not in communion with our own Church, there is in the diocese, amongst churchmen and others, a kindlier spirit and a more reasonable attitude than are to be found in many parts of England, and I thank God for it. There is a tolerance which comes not of shallowness but of depth. If I am deeply convinced of the truth that I hold I can afford to be tolerant of what other men hold, and I am more likely to win them if I am tolerant and charitable, and respect their convictions and co-operate with them in ways open to me, than if I hold aloof and fail to recognize motives and efforts as conscientious as my own. I have been struck since I came into residence in your midst with this kindlier spirit and wiser toleration, both among schools of thought in our own Church, and as between our

own Church and members of other Christian bodies. The atmosphere is congenial to one who abhors party spirit and faction, and loves to see agreement rather than difference; and I am convinced that in such an atmosphere there is real promise of the effective building up of the Church of Christ.

But it is not only in its history and the contact of forms of Christianity that this diocese is so profoundly interesting a study. What a variety of classes we have amongst us, and how strangely the population is gathered together or scattered abroad: Old Northumbrian families, Scotch shepherds on the Cheviots, strong tillers of the soil, who are better fed and educated and do more work than most of their brothers in the South, miners who are largely an hereditary class, sons and grandsons of miners, without that large importation from Ireland or Wales that has been necessary in the smaller area but far more rapidly developing mineral fields of Durham, artizans on Tyneside, merchants and shipbuilders of Newcastle, form the material that has to be welded together into one Divine society in this diocese. While of the half-million or more of the people, three-fifths live within the ten miles that separate Benwell Tower and the sea, and if another fifth be allowed for the colliery district of the East Coast, the other fifth is scattered over a county which is in area the fifth, and one of the most beautiful, of England, and which with some quarter of a million more acres than Lancashire contains but one eighth of its population. The variety of class is suggestive as to the character of the diocese, while the grouping of the people shews where the increasing pressure on the Church's resources is most severely felt.

I find it impossible to attempt any review of the Diocese since my predecessor's last visitation in 1891. He was prevented by illness from visiting in 1895, the chancellor

going alone to admit the churchwardens, and on January 16th, 1896, he ceased to be Bishop of Newcastle. I shall attempt, therefore, simply to deal with the period since my consecration on January 25th, 1896.

We have lost from the Diocese, in good old age, Canon Edmunds, who retained his connection with Durham, and died in ripe old age; Canons Bird, Lintott, and Baldwin, from among our own Honorary Canons; and, by retirement, alike from his benefice and his stall, Canon Sanders, Vicar of St. Paul's, Newcastle. Canon Barker, though he has retired from the Rectory of Hexham, and Mr. Wilson, who has retired from Ellingham, still happily live amongst us. But death has removed from our ranks A. T. Coates, Vicar of Percy Main, T. W. Gibson, Rector of Kirkhaugh, W. D. Ground, Rector of Kirkharle, M. Lazenby, Vicar of Doddington, R. Measham, Rector of Bellingham, J. Oliver, Vicar of Lucker, H. Parminter, Incumbent of Humshaugh. From amongst the laity perhaps I may single out the late Colonel Mitford, who died just before I came into residence in 1896, John Henry Ingledew, Secretary to the two first Bishops of this See, the late Duke of Northumberland, so large a benefactor of the Diocese, Andrew J. Blackett-Ord, who devoted himself, among much other Church work, specially to the Clergy Pensions Institution, and, within the past week, Robert Gurney Hoare, as losses which deserve special mention. Four incumbents have left us by exchange of benefice, and three, in addition to not a few curates, by acceptance of preferment in other dioceses.

Not to mention the Vicar of St. Aidan's, Benwell, whose appointment was one of my predecessor's last acts, I have instituted or admitted to their benefices, twenty-eight incumbents, but none since the Benefices Act came into force on January 1st, last. I have collated and

Clergy and
Ordina-
tions.

installed four Honorary Canons, licensed four chaplains, admitted one warden to office in the Diocesan House of Mercy, and licensed 133 curates.

There were on the books of the Diocese on Trinity Sunday 320 clergy, or 102 more than appear to have belonged to the Diocese at the time of its severance from Durham in 1882. But this number, though it takes no account of eight vacant curacies and two vacant Diocesan chaplaincies, includes two incumbents not yet admitted to benefices, three non-resident Honorary Canons, two incumbents and one lecturer, who are permitted to reside out of the diocese, and three retired clergy who have no licences to officiate in the diocese. There are 169 incumbents, but three of these hold two cures each, which might be held separately. There were on Trinity Sunday 129 curates, but the full number, if all vacancies were filled, would be 137. The other clergy include the Archdeacon of Northumberland, and others licensed in various ways to serve or officiate in the diocese. The number of clergy whom I have ordained is rather beyond the average of former years. In 1896, I ordained thirteen deacons (in addition to one by letters dimissory for the Bishop of Grahamstown) and ten priests, in 1897, fifteen deacons and seven priests, in 1898, fourteen deacons and sixteen priests. On Sunday last I ordained nine deacons and nine priests. The total number in three-and-a-half years is, for the diocese, fifty one deacons and forty-two priests.

Confirma-
tions.

The Confirmations in like manner somewhat exceed the average of the previous five years, since the last Episcopal visitation in 1891.

For the years 1891-95, the average was :

43 centres. 1,123 males. 1,727 females. Total 2,850.

The returns for the past three years are :

Year	Centres.	Males.	Females.	Totals.
1896	53	1,382	1,907	3,289
1897	65	1,226	1,993	3,219
1898	58	1,253	1,657	2,910

I note with satisfaction that of the increased average of 289, 164 represent males and 125 females, and I notice that while the number for 1898 showed a diminution of 309, compared with the previous year, there was an actual increase of 27 male candidates. So far this year, the number confirmed up to the present time is in excess of any of my previous years, and gives promise of a large total for the year.

Mere numbers at confirmations mean but little, but I should not be true to my convictions if I did not say that I have been increasingly struck with the careful preparation and reverent receptive demeanour of the candidates. It is quite a rare exception to see any degree of thoughtlessness, and when I compare this with the state of things which prevailed half-a-century ago, I can only heartily thank God. As one who has himself prepared large numbers of persons of all ages for this holy ordinance, I wish to testify to its extraordinary value in advancing the spiritual life of our people, and not unfrequently being quite the turning point of a life. I am certain that no pains can be too great in the preparation, and that no pastoral work is in the best sense more remunerative. It is an ordinance for all ages. I have both presented and confirmed aged men and women, and it is always a real pleasure to me when adults, and often married couples, kneel to receive the laying on of hands with prayer. Such persons set a tone to the confirmation and prevent it from being regarded as a mere religious form denoting a particular age in life. The preparation should be extended over an adequate time, for I am persuaded that

time is a most important element in the preparation. Three months are not too long a time for classes to go on, and I was always unwilling myself, as a Parish Priest, to concentrate the teaching into a shorter period than ten weeks. I urge incumbents who give titles for Holy Orders not to entrust deacons in their parishes with the important work of preparation, but rather to teach their deacons how to prepare by requesting them to attend some classes conducted by the incumbents themselves. The responsibility which this involves will often be a great blessing to the incumbent himself, by stimulating him to be continually improving his own methods and deepening the spirituality with which he seeks to influence the souls which he is training for the future Christian life. Let me further suggest the importance in this preparation of placing in the foreground the blessings which God the Holy Spirit conveys through the ordinance, whether directly or by the further blessings to which it leads. What is needed is to engender such a sense of the Fatherly love of God and such depth of gratitude that the fulfilment of the baptismal vows may be felt to be no burden, but rather the natural and eager response of the grateful heart. The vows being simply the expression of the Christian life, and inseparably connected with the very idea of Christianity, are binding on us all, whether any Godparents, or we ourselves, have acknowledged them or not; but I have known cases in which persons have shrunk from responsibilities that seem so great, when they have been represented as the leading idea in confirmation rather than as the response of a grateful heart to love which has already found expression in Baptism, and finds fresh outlet in the apostolic ordinance of the laying on of hands.

Confirmation in every case presupposes Baptism, and I desire upon this point to address some words to the clergy.

I have noticed with pleasure that in the visitation returns made to me it is rare to find that there has been any neglect of infant Baptism. The Christian bodies outside the Church of England with which, in this diocese, we are most brought into contact, the Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and Primitive Methodists, are careful to baptize their children, and the result of all working in the same direction is that the neglect of Baptism, except in a few parishes, is rare. This condition is far more favourable than in other large town populations in which my lot has been hitherto cast. The difficult problem, what should be the Church's attitude in view of the frequent carelessness and the difficulty of finding suitable sponsors, is one which was considered by a committee of Bishops at the recent Lambeth conference. I could not publish and endorse the resolutions arrived at by the Bishops, in my judgment somewhat too broadly and without adequate qualification, unless I were able to add a few words of explanation. The resolutions were these :

(48) "That in the opinion of this conference it is of
 "much importance that in all cases of Infant Baptism the
 "clergyman should take all possible care to see that provi-
 "sion is made for the Christian training of the child, but
 "that, unless in cases of great and exceptional difficulty, the
 "baptism should not be deferred."

(49) "That the baptismal promise of repentance,
 "faith, and obedience should be made either privately or
 "publicly by those who, having been baptized without these
 "promises, are brought by our clergy to confirmation by
 "the Bishop."

The first remark I wish to make is that these resolutions must be interpreted by the Encyclical Letter, and must not be understood as of universal application. They certainly do not apply to the mission field, or to some branches of our Church, such as the West Indies, where

the Archbishop has addressed to his Clergy in Jamaica weighty words of counsel suitable to their special circumstances. The words of the Encyclical are:—

“We find that too many of the Clergy, *especially in the large towns of England*, are troubled by doubts, whether, in the present circumstances of life, especially where population is perpetually moving, infants ought to be baptized, when there seems to be so little security for their due instruction. We desire to impress upon the Clergy the need of taking all possible care to see that provision is made for the Christian training of the child, but that, unless in cases of great and exceptional difficulty, the baptism of the child should not be deferred.”

But I think these words need some further guarding. I have been familiar with the difficulties that have often arisen in the mission field with respect to the right time of baptism. I have, myself, been responsible for the baptism of upwards of 700 persons of riper years in England, and probably few Clergy have been responsible for the baptism of more children of various ages, and there is only one justification for the baptism of children when there is from circumstances of family real doubt as to their Christian training.

Remember that in the mission field no missionary of any experience dreams of baptising a child unless there be some adequate guarantee. To baptise a young Hindu or Mahomedan child, and let him fall back to the care of a non-Christian parent, would be a profanation of the Sacrament. Baptism is far better understood even by many heathen people in India than it is by many Christians at home. It is the Sacrament of a new *birth*, and not of a new growth. It is the initial step, the beginning that must lead further, the transfer into a new condition with a view to training and entire moulding to God's will, or to speak in

metaphor, the seed which requires to be tended and watered if it is to grow and bear fruit. To treat it as an end in itself, as an adequate protection without the assurance of any Christian training, would be to misunderstand its meaning and risk the failure of its efficacy. When, therefore, the Bishops say that, unless in cases of grave and exceptional difficulty, the baptism should not be deferred, they mean, and I honestly wish this had been more clearly brought out, that they rely on the great doctrine of the sponsorship of the Church, and that they advise as a general rule that baptism should proceed, because they believe that in a Christian land like England, with a Church in every parish and every house being in some area called a parish, it is so possible to teach the responsibility of the entire Church for the Christian training of the young, that even if satisfactory individual guarantee be not forthcoming, the child may be baptised on the faith and guarantee of the Christian society, the Church at large. This truth is well brought out in a book to which I shall make frequent reference in this charge, and which I commend, especially in these days of unrest, to every Clergyman and many laymen in this Diocese, the late Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures, published by Messrs. J. Parker & Co., on the Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ, lectures which I heard delivered at Oxford, and which have been more helpful to me than almost any book of modern theology.

I quote the following passages, (Lecture V.):—

“That which the mother brings is first faith. The
 “infant, incapable by age of coming in faith of his own,
 “comes in borrowed faith. But from whom is his faith
 “borrowed? Is it from his natural parents? Yes, no
 “doubt in part, if they be good and faithful. But what if
 “they be evil and unfaithful? Is it then from his sponsors?
 “Yes, if, again, they be good and faithful. But no man
 “can say for certain that they are so. Nay, it is upon the

“faith of the Church of Christ, whom the sponsors on the special occasion, and for the special purpose, represent. Hear again St. Augustine on this point :—

“‘Little children are presented to receive spiritual grace not so much by those in whose hands they are carried, though it is done by them also, if they be themselves good and faithful, as by the whole society of good and faithful people. . . . So the whole Church; the mother, who is in all the Saints, doeth this thing. The whole Church beareth all, the whole Church beareth each.’

“But, secondly, the mother brings the promise of breeding the children up in the faith of God, so as to enable them, by all the means which God has put into their power, to lead the rest of their lives according to their beginning. She undertakes that nothing shall be wanting to them of all the graces of which she is the authorised and empowered channel, whereby they may grow in the faith and obedience of Christ, and realise at last the immortal inheritance of which the right and title have in the sacrament of baptism been effectually conveyed to them.”

“Though the sponsors be of course, personally charged with the undertaking of which I speak, yet is the Church at large by no means wholly discharged from the obligation of it. Therefore, the supply of Church schools and the support of them, and in like manner the supply of Churches and of all the outward means necessary for the maintenance and growth of the spiritual life given in Holy Baptism is not to be regarded as a matter of Christian bounty or benevolence on the part of Christian people at large, but as a distinct obligation which may not be disowned—an obligation as binding in its nature upon them as the breeding of children with food and raiment and all things

“necessary to make them good citizens is obligatory upon the natural parents. The spiritual mother can no more discharge herself of all that is necessary for the spiritual growth of him, whom by bearing she has undertaken to breed up for his Spiritual Father, than the natural parents can discharge themselves of the corresponding obligation in respect of the natural breeding of their own naturally born child.”

These are weighty words, and I venture to commend them to my brethren of the clergy. They constitute the real argument for general baptizing of infants in a Christian land. We could not dare to do it in default of thoroughly satisfactory guarantee in each case, unless we relied on a Christian Society, in each parish, regarding this Christian training of the child as a part of the entire Church's duty. And I urge you my brethren in Christ, to urge this duty on the laity of your parishes. They being members of the Church share this duty. In a very true sense you are the greatest sponsors of all, being the responsible guides and ministers of the Church in your several cures. You cannot so put off the duty on others, as though it were no care of yours except to baptize those whom others brought and whose Christian training they guaranteed. But you will do good work in reminding the laity of the sponsorial duty which falls on them of caring for the whole body of Christ.

This thought naturally leads me to the functions of the laity in the Church, and in this Diocese in particular. These functions are deliberative and executive, and I emphasise the union of the two. Of the former I hope to speak at Morpeth, when I come to consider some questions bearing on our relation to the state, and on past or projected legislation. But to-day I wish to say that the spiritual development of the laity in the work which they must do for the Master, is one of the problems which the Church must

Spiritual
work of the
Laity.

work out. The revised version of the New Testament has thrown a new light on an old text in the great passage in Ephes. iv. 11, 12, that "God gave some to be apostles and "some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and "teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, unto the (i.e., their) "work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of "Christ." That is orders and offices in the Church of Christ are intended to equip and develop the baptised laymen for their work of service (*ergon diakonias*), a work, however, to be done not at random, but in due orderly manner, so that the whole body of Christ may be built up.

It is our business, my brethren of the clergy, to equip the laity for this task. However small or scattered a parish may be, your work is not done when you have supplied ministrations, visited sick, and taught the young. You have to equip the baptised laity for their work of service. Only by constant teaching of this truth shall we get laymen to understand what a spiritual power they may be in a parish or in the Diocese.

Let me illustrate ways in which this truth has lately come out among us.

I have had the pleasure of dedicating two Church Army vans, which go from parish to parish in the diocese, manned by good laymen trained by the Church Army, carrying on parochial missions with the glad concurrence of the clergy and stirring up fresh spiritual life. Here is an illustration of a layman's work of service.

Again, I lately had the pleasure of licensing, as lay readers in a mining parish, five young men connected with the collieries, carefully trained by the vicar with the help of a trained Lichfield evangelist, and now giving up their spare time to direct spiritual work.

Again, there are laymen in Newcastle who have bound themselves in a missionary union to acquaint themselves

with the history of certain foreign missions, and to give addresses and lantern lectures to stimulate interest in mission work.

Church Army evangelists—one, let me say, has recently conducted a fruitful mission in our Newcastle prison, with the glad concurrence of the authorities; police-court missionaries—of whom I am thankful that we now have one, to be followed, I trust, hereafter, by others; nurses—let me especially commend the admirable Cathedral Nurse and Loan Society, and, in other parts of the county, the excellent society and organisation started by the Duchess of Northumberland; Church Lads' or Boys' Brigades; Medical Missions in foreign fields; and industrial missions, by teaching how to build up a Christian society in a heathen land—all these illustrate special works for which men and women have been equipped. But we need something much larger still, and I desire to make more widely known, and to press the keen working of, the Diocesan Lay Helpers' Association, the direct outcome of our Diocesan Conference, and details of which are to be found on page 216 of our Diocesan Calendar for 1899. The object of the association is to develop and organise lay work in every rural deanery, to give a Diocesan recognition to such lay helpers as are now working or may hereafter work in any parish, and who may desire thus to realise that they are members of a far larger body than the parish to which they belong, and to develop the already existing system of lay readers, and train others to do evangelistic and pastoral work under the clergy in the parishes where they live, and other parishes with the consent of the incumbent. I utterly refuse to believe that there is a single parish of this diocese in which some of the laity, men and women, may not be equipped for some work of service. When I hear that clergy have no one to help them, I simply think what a grand work is waiting to be done in quickening

the laity of all classes to do some real spiritual work. You, my brethren, who are churchwardens, have a most important work of service to do. Your reverent care of the fabrics intrusted to you—some of them of the deepest historical interest—your wise administration of Church finances, your zeal in helping your clergy, giving them such counsel as you, the mouthpiece of the laity in your parishes, are able to give, your efforts to make the Church and her ministrations welcome to the parishioners—all this is a work of service, necessary, honourable, of ancient tradition in this land of ours, which you are enabled to render to our one Lord. There is no one thing which more rouses my enthusiasm, and for which I would not gladly make any sacrifice in my power, than this work of training the laity to realise their very real priesthood and the invaluable service which every one of them can render. and every one of them is really bound to render, to the Church of Christ.

May I add that if this joint work of clergy and laity is to develop there is one thing which this diocese largely needs, and that is a great addition to its mission halls and parochial buildings. Our whole conception of parochial work has made such advance during this last half-century that the "plant," if I may use the expression, which contented our forefathers, is quite insufficient now. The Church is the spiritual centre, and the school will be the training ground both on week-days and on Sundays. But there must be the parochial building to be the workshop of the clergy and lay workers, without which the work will be stunted and dwarfed, classes and club cannot be maintained, or other needful work done. Perhaps I may add that parish teas have their very real importance, and that I have always found a copper to be a necessary adjunct of every mission or parochial building that I put up. If any men of wealth would place at my disposal a sum of money to be used at

my discretion, or at the discretion of the Diocesan Society, for the purpose of encouraging parishes to provide such buildings, they would be doing a greater spiritual work than perhaps they know. We want not merely to teach religion and minister the Sacraments, but to build up a Society. The work must be done parish by parish. In a city like Newcastle it can be greatly aided by a Church Institute, such as that which was provided by the energetic initiative of the late Vicar of Newcastle, and which is only prevented by the burden of a heavy mortgage from developing its work and becoming a far greater centre of Church work. I wish most heartily to commend the proposals made by the present Vicar of Newcastle for relieving the institute of its debt, and it will then, I trust, be considerably altered by a skilful architect and adapted to meet further needs. But while a large town may rightly have its social Church centre, every parish needs its parochial building, and many parishes need a couple of mission halls, either in crowded streets or in scattered hamlets, where clergy and laymen may minister, and teach, and draw men together, for the extension of our Master's kingdom.

And yet I know full well that when we have drawn out the powers of the laity to the fullest, there will still be the need for more clergy. I thank God that our number has increased almost fifty per cent since the See was formed, but consider how great has been the development of the industries of Tyneside, and of the population of Tyneside towns, in these seventeen years. How are we to meet this increase? To a certain extent by new parishes. I have already been able to form one, S. Mary, Blyth, with 11,000 people, out of the great overgrown parish of Horton, which is still left with 9,000, possibly 10,000, souls living in six centres. I am hoping to consecrate in July, a new church, St. Gabriel's, Heaton, to be a new centre among our east end artisans,

Increase of
population
on Tyne-
side. How
to be met.

and I am glad to announce that an anonymous friend has placed at my disposal the sum of £1,000, which with a site offered by the kindness of Mr. Watson Armstrong will, I doubt not, be met hereafter by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the space of the two successive years with an equivalent for the purpose of building a parsonage house. And I hope we may soon start a similar mission in the extreme west, at Scotswood, in the parish of Benwell, in which a large population will very soon gather and in which a site has been kindly offered by a landowner, and another sum has been anonymously promised of £1,000 for endowment, to be met hereafter by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the purpose of a parsonage house. I hope, too, a year hence, having been disappointed this year, to hear that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have been able, out of the great tithes in their possession, to endow another new parish out of the struggling parish of Newburn, to be called St. John's Whorlton, where church and parsonage have been already built. But while these are in the immediate future, and there must be a few other new parishes, I venture to express my conviction that we have almost come to an end of the great development in this direction which followed on the establishment of this See. In colliery districts it is extremely important to be assured of the permanence of the settlement before a new parish is formed. And in town parishes I venture to submit that there is some danger of forgetting the great power of numbers, which have been realised as yet far less in religious than in political and social matters. A large parish, manned by a capable man, with the aid of a considerable staff of clergy living together, may become a great power for good. The necessary business of a parish can all be concentrated in one place, and there is the more time and room for spiritual and social work. There may, too, be a variety in the same parish of methods

and forms of worship. The stately Parish Church with its reverent and dignified services may appeal to some, while the humbler Mission Room with its greater elasticity may appeal to others. Even in a street which seems absolutely of one level you will find a great variety of mind needing a great variety of spiritual treatment. And I know from some experience there is a rare power when a body of clergy work together. Each learns something from the other. Corners are rounded off. One man has one gift that the parish needs, another has another gift, and all can be developed, and men become so attached to this common life that they are contented to give long years to it, without craving for the so-called independence of an incumbency which, as many know, may not have half the attractions, while it may have double the cares and discouragements, of the associated work in the town parish.

It is partly because I desire hereafter, if opportunity should offer, to ensure better some kind of continuity of treatment of this kind in Newcastle parishes, that I have lately come to an agreement with the Crown whereby, of the nine livings now in the alternate patronage of Crown and Bishop, four, including two of the largest in Newcastle (S. Philip's S. Michael's, Byker, and S. Matthew's, Newcastle, with Amble,) will in future be in the patronage of the Bishop, while four others (S. Cuthbert's, Newcastle, Seghill, Howden Panns, and Willington-on-Tyne,) will be in the patronage of the Crown, the provisions of the Act under which the Churches were built remaining otherwise untouched. But a considerable increase of clergy will be needed. Jesmond, and S. George's (Jesmond), Byker, Walker, and, perhaps most of all, Benwell, are so rapidly developing that serious efforts must be made to meet the increasing needs. When the census of 1901 is taken it may be necessary to take further joint steps for the extension of the Church on the Tyne.

Exchange
of patron-
age with
the Crown.

Meanwhile, let me say how thankful I am to the clergy, and especially the laity of the diocese, for the increased support of the Diocesan Society, with its women's auxiliary, and of its most important offshoot, the Bishop's Additional Clergy Fund, which has already added a dozen to the clergy of the diocese. One of these aided by the fund especially deserves mention, because he represents a new institution—a chaplain to the Deaf and Dumb, who is able to minister to them in the manual and sign language. The Diocesan Society with its subfunds, the Bishops' Additional Clergy Fund, and the Diocesan Inspection Fund, to which I shall refer again hereafter, is now raising nearly £4,000 a-year, or nearly double what was raised in 1896. But we have not overtaken the needs, and now that the Bishop of Newcastle's Fund, which has done so great a work on Tyneside, has ceased to exist, there is the more need strenuously to maintain the permanent agencies of the diocese. I know I shall not appeal in vain to laymen who have treated me with such generous consideration when I bring before them well considered plans for further spiritual growth. I cannot say how great is our debt to the great central societies which provide clergy, such as the Additional Curates' and the Church Pastoral Aid Societies, which receive as yet from us but a poor return for their generous grants, or to those which help our Schools, or Churches, or Mission Buildings—such as the National Society, the Incorporated Church Building Society, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

One care, however, I feel bound to mention. These Societies, Central and Diocesan, which help us to provide additional clergy, do not solve the question of the scanty incomes on which so many clergy have to do, and do, their work of love. I know too well with what noble self-denial many are labouring for Christ. Our Diocesan Branch of the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund has enabled us to

distribute some £400 for two successive years, but it is very inadequately known and supported. The Clergy Pensions Institution appears to me full of the richest promise for the future, for already, through the generous help of the public, a very moderate subscription, which by itself would ensure £15 15s. a year at the age of sixty-five, now ensures a pension of £50. I strongly advise all young clergy to join this admirable institution at once and so develop self-help. But still the cry of distress is sad and serious. Even with the generous help of the Diocesan Sons of the Clergy, and the Barrington and Crewe Funds, there is many an anxiety for a child's education and many a care silently borne. I would only say to the laity of those of whom I speak, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things?"

I must close this part of our Diocesan Review, by expressing my thankfulness that two Diocesan efforts in which my predecessor and Mrs. Wilberforce took a deep interest, and with which the names of Canon and Mrs. Pennefather will be inseparably connected, the Diocesan House of Mercy at Gosforth, and the Diocesan Home for Waifs and Strays at Cullercoats, have during the period under review been completed and formally opened, and are doing a most useful work. It gives me special satisfaction to know that the income of the House of Mercy last year sufficed to give a small sum to the liquidation of the debt, which by the kindness of an anonymous donor of £1,000, is now reduced to £1,000, and that the income of the Home for Waifs and Strays last year permitted a substantial sum to be remitted to the Central Society in London.

Diocesan
Homes.

I have so far confined myself to our Diocesan needs and Diocesan growth. I must proceed to-morrow to deal with certain symptoms of unrest which betray themselves in the Church of which we form a part.

CHARGE,

DELIVERED IN HEXHAM ABBEY, ON THE 31ST DAY OF
MAY, 1899.

II.—DISQUIET IN THE CHURCH.

WE are passing, at the present time, through a period of disquiet in the Church, which seems to me to be disturbing the minds of some who do not examine causes, and have no power of forecast, beyond what is necessary or historically just. This old Church of ours has passed through many a crisis before, and is likely to pass through many another. I have known several in my own lifetime. The very vigour and intellectual and spiritual activity that characterise our day inevitably lead to some collision of conviction, while the fact that the Church has not yet the spiritual autonomy that would enable her representative bodies to meet difficulties as they arise necessitates patience in the slower working out of problems that for the moment seem to some to be insoluble. Speaking for myself, as a man who has declined to identify himself exclusively with any special school of thought in the Church, and seeing as I do the real good to be found in all, and having a passionate enthusiasm for the Church as a whole, rather than for any special part of it, I honestly say that I am not too much alarmed by the symptoms of unrest and uneasiness which have found not always wise expression during the past year and a half.

Grounds of
confidence.

It is not that there have not been serious grounds for concern, but simply that many of us have foreseen them and discounted them, and felt certain that the very evil would lead to its own cure. Before I go into details, I should like to ask whether anyone seriously believes that the Church of

England is in a more dangerous condition now than when, more than thirty years ago, I was admitted to the ministry? I say, with some confidence, that she is in a much better condition, despite all the troubles that have come to the surface, and even in respect of ritual and the doctrine that it is intended to symbolise. And I base my conviction on two grounds. First, despite all this agitation, there is a much better understanding between men of different schools of thought than obtained thirty years ago, a much greater disposition to work together, a much greater realisation of the fact that they simply emphasize different features in one Church, to which they are deeply attached. And this better understanding is having the most wholesome effect on the younger clergy, who are far less divided by party lines than when I was ordained. It is sometimes represented that an extreme school is domineering and undermining the established position deliberately taken by the Church in the settlement which took final shape in 1662, and that moderate men are holding aloof and giving the Bishops no assistance in their efforts to keep the doctrinal teaching and the ritual of the Church in their defined limits. This is not my experience at all. The best friends of the Church of England now are not those who take part in wordy warfare, but those who by quiet and private counsel are striving to create a deeper enthusiasm for the principles whom the Church of England enshrines, and I gladly testify to the hearty co-operation of the best men of this diocese with their Bishop in his efforts so to use the present feeling in the Church of England that the Church may go on her way the stronger and purer for the work to which God has called her. I doubt if, thirty years ago, there would have been the same mutual understanding. Prosecutions in courts of law were causing many good men to hold aloof altogether, and a Bishop could not do then what I believe he will more and more be able to do

now in influencing his clergy as their Father in God. The things which men have deplored of late, and which have caused much uneasiness, have done precisely what I anticipated in bringing to the private assistance of the Bishops men whose churchmanship and moderation have been invaluable in restraining excesses and teaching what they, more than others, are able to persuade the too impetuous to do or refrain from doing. In this process time is essential. I may be sanguine, but my belief is that a true constitutional episcopacy, realised far more than ever since I have had a mind to think, will be the outcome of what men call this crisis.

And my second ground of confidence is the growing position of the laity in the Church. The clergy are but the officers and ministers of the Church. The Church consists of clergy and laity. And the laity have not taken their proper place. The so-called autocracy of the clergy, while I am not defending it, has frequently arisen from the ignorance or indifference of laymen and from their leaving every thing for the clergy to do. Thank God, times are changing. Far greater interest is now being taken by laymen in Church matters, whether local, diocesan, or general, and they are far better instructed in what the Church of England really holds, teaches and expects. We simply want this process to go on. As it goes on it will be largely the remedy for any excesses of clerical zeal. No clergyman, when he has intelligent laity at his back, showing his enthusiasm for the Church to which they alike belong, will desire or hazard the alienation of their sympathy by autocratic conduct or practices alien to the Church. He will prefer travelling slowly if he carries his laity with him to express speed if he is to travel on the engine alone. I spoke yesterday of the sponsorship of the entire Church, clergy and laity, and the need of the laity realizing that more. I spoke of the work

of service which each layman, just because he is a layman, is able and is bound to render. You, my brethren of the laity, by entering into all the work of your clergy, by coming to know more of the history of the grand old Church which we serve, by understanding with more intelligent knowledge the history and meaning of the Prayer-book and all Church institutions, will prove the best guarantee possible against reactionary movements in the Church. You will be the best support to the clergy in all right work, and the best check, and that without friction or antagonism but by the sure working of intelligible laws, in courses which seem to lead to danger. No man who studies the real undercurrents in English thought, who can see below the surface of painful agitations, who is able to perceive the gradual working towards a real and constitutional, not despotic, Episcopacy on the one hand, and the gradual movement towards hearty, instructed lay co-operation, alike in deliberation and in practical work, on the other, can have one shadow of doubt as to the issue of present complications. "The Lord sitteth above the waterfloods. The Lord remaineth a King for ever."

With these general considerations I pass on to consider some of the causes of the disquiet to which I have referred. They are mainly three, which I give in the inverse order of their importance. First, the introduction of additional services without authority and the use of the church for purposes other than those expressly provided for in the Prayer-book, and at the discretion of the incumbent alone.

Secondly, the introduction of ceremonies, or variation of offices, contrary to, or at least not prescribed in, the book of Common Prayer.

Thirdly, the teaching, orally or by symbol, of doctrine inconsistent with the settlement of 1662.

Causes of
disquiet.

(i.) As to the first complaint the chief cure is to be found in an appeal to authority and common sense. If a church could never be used for purposes other than those expressly provided for in the Prayer-book, religion would suffer damage; and there is continuous precedent since the Reformation for its occasional use, under the authority of the Ordinary, for other purposes. Here in Northumberland we should have no places for Sunday Schools in many parishes if we might not use the churches. One of the best Missionary Meetings I ever attended was at a Philadelphia church, one Sunday evening after Evening Prayer, during the holding of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, when three Bishops in succession gave addresses which I have never forgotten. The one thing that is needed is a central and responsible authority to regulate. It is obvious that the result is chaos if each man is able to exercise his own discretion and to use his church for any additional services or purposes that he personally approves. But the laity of this diocese need be under no apprehension whatever. In my "Articles of Enquiry," addressed to the clergy, I asked these questions:

"Is the church, or any consecrated chapel of Ease
 "in your parish, used for any other purposes than Divine
 "Service in accordance with the Prayer Book? If so,
 "specify the purposes."

"If it is so used, what forms of service or manuals are
 "used at such additional services? Send a copy of each
 "form of service or manual that may be used."

These questions have been most frankly and explicitly answered. I have examined every manual or form of prayer used. They are mainly connected with the Sunday Schools, Communicants' Guilds, Meetings for Home or Foreign Missions, Mothers' Union, or Girls' Friendly Society Services, and the like. I have had very little cause to

criticise or amend. In some cases I have been struck with the care taken by the Clergy to identify the church with the common life of their people. In no single case has there been anything but the frankest acceptance of any emendation which I had to suggest or the most entire loyalty to my direction as Bishop. I desire to be as inclusive, and not exclusive, as possible, but I am responsible for definite Church of England limits, and I maintain that on this ground there is no just complaint against the Clergy of the Diocese. At the same time the uneasiness has done real good by enforcing what ought all along to have been done, and will now not cease to be done, the submission to the Bishop of every form of prayer to be used at additional services, and the acceptance of his direction as to the uses to which a church may be legitimately put. In this way we have already gained something from our troubles, and it is gained with the good will and concurrence of the Church at large.

(ii.) With reference to the second cause of uneasiness, I ought in like manner to give an assurance to the Diocese. I asked in my Articles of Enquiry the following question :

“If in any way the order of the Book of Common Prayer is not strictly followed, state what variations or omissions are made?”

Alteration
in Services.

The replies have been frank and explicit. I have found no cases in which there has been any violation of the spirit of the Prayer-book, although here and there I may have thought that a little sounder judgment might have prevailed. To observe the Prayer-book strictly it would be necessary every Sunday morning to have full Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion Service, and it will be generally admitted that there should be, subject to the ordinary, some discretion in these matters with a view to greater edification. But the variations have not been serious, and there has

been no disloyalty to Church of England standards. The more entirely we adhere to the direction of the Prayer-book the more united shall we be. It would be, for instance, that I may take a crucial case, entirely unauthorised to vary or shorten the services prescribed for the administration of the Sacraments, except in discretionary omission, in accordance with custom that dates far back, of the long invitations to the Holy Communion or the longer exhortation to Communicants, and yet even in such cases with the proviso that the passages omitted, which do not affect the structure and spirit of the service, are from time to time read so that the people may hear them. Before great festivals, especially Easter, it is well to read the whole invitation to Communicants, and sometimes the alternative invitation, which will probably apply to some members of the congregation, and which it is well for all to hear. Under any exceptional circumstances, reference should be always made to the Bishop.

Ritual.

With reference to matters of ritual, I shall be very brief indeed. I ask the Clergy of the Diocese, though really I have little need to ask them, to consider the decisions of the late Archbishop of Canterbury and his assessors in the case, "Read and others *v.* the Bishop of Lincoln," as binding in this Diocese, though delivered in the Province of Canterbury. I am sure that no one desires that these matters should be brought before a Court again. They were most carefully examined by a competent Ecclesiastical Court, and they came under the scrutiny of a Court of Appeal. In one case, indeed, the matter of lights on the Holy Table, the Privy Council refrained, on a technical ground, from expressing any opinion on the judgment, but they might have done so, and the fact that they did not is significant. I hold, therefore, that on this matter too the judgment of the Archbishop's Court is in possession until it

be altered by any higher authority. I shall append the decisions to my charge, but briefly they are mainly these—that the mixing of the wine with water in and as part of the Communion Service is against the law of the Church, but that there is no ground for pronouncing the use of a cup mixed beforehand to be an ecclesiastical offence: that the eastward position in the Communion Service is a legitimate interpretation of the rubric, but that the manual acts in the Prayer of Consecration must be performed in such wise as to be visible to the Communicants properly placed; that the singing of an anthem, such as “O Lamb of God,” immediately after the Prayer of Consecration is not an illegal addition to the Service; that the law is not broken by the mere fact of two lighted candles, when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, standing on the Holy Table continuously through the service: and that making the Sign of the Cross in the Absolution or in the Benediction is an innovation, and may not be allowed. The question having been raised, I am bound to say further that the rubric at the end of the Communion Service is absolutely binding, which prescribes that “there shall be no celebration of the “Lord’s Supper unless there be a convenient number to “communicate with the Priest according to his discretion, “the term ‘convenient’ being limited by the rubric that “follows, which explains it as not less than ‘four or three at “the least.’” We are but little affected in this Diocese by the questions which have been or are to be raised before the two Archbishops as to Incense, Reservation of the Holy Communion, and other points, but I am quite certain that any decision come to will be by every clergyman frankly accepted without the necessity of my saying one word. Indeed, we are so little affected by the agitation on these matters of ritual elsewhere that I should hardly feel it necessary to deal with them if it were not true that we

cannot evade our responsibilities as an integral part of the Church of England. I believe that in no part of England is there so little disquiet as in the three northern dioceses. We have our different schools of thought and our different practises, but I have found both sides alike reasonable, and of all the blessings for which we have to thank Almighty God in this Diocese I thank Him for none more than for this comparative freedom from bitter antagonisms and party spirit.

Questions
of doctrine.

Confession.

(iii.) The main questions, however, on which controversy has raged during the last year have been less those of ritual than such as are concerned directly with doctrine, and I wish to speak to you frankly, upon three questions, words which may, I hope, lead to a better understanding. First, as to confession to a priest. This is, I am convinced, the main point on which there has been uneasiness in England during the past year. An idea has gained ground that men are trying to introduce it, not as an exceptional remedy, but as the habitual custom and discipline of the Church. There have been proofs that it has been very strongly pressed on candidates for confirmation, so strongly indeed as to be something more than pressure. And it has been freely urged that there has been a current teaching to the effect that some sins can only be forgiven by absolution, privately given after a special confession of sin, and that in every case it is really requisite in the eyes of a well instructed Churchman. And there is fear lest English character should lose something of its robustness as this teaching grows and is encouraged.

And yet I cannot think that this alleged danger has been wisely met. Men have denied that confession is recognized by the Church of England at all, and have so bitterly opposed it as to make many men perplexed as to the meaning of the words used in the ordination of Priests and in the Visitation of the Sick.

I cannot hope to succeed where others have failed, and yet I own to you, my brothers of clergy and laity alike, that the position taken by the Church of England, as distinct from that of the Church of Rome and from that of most non-episcopal bodies, appears to me the only position which an intelligent study of the New Testament would lead an unprejudiced man to take up. I seem to find in it so entirely the *terra firma* on which I wish to stand that I hope I may help a few to clearer views. The real key to the position is this—What did our Lord mean when He said to His disciples on the evening of the first Easter Day—“Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them.” It is His first message to the little Church assembled together. From the narrative of St. Luke it is clear that others besides Apostles were present when these words were said, and therefore, as the Bishop of Durham has pointed out, “The Commission must be regarded properly as the Commission of the Christian Society and not as that of the Christian Ministry.” But observe, it is a commission of absolution entrusted to this Society, and the promise, I again quote the Bishop, “carries with it of necessity the character of perpetuity. The Society never dies.” I say nothing yet as to the method of administering the absolution, but if our Lord’s first words to the Society are to entrust them with remitting sins in His name and by His power, is it not a mistaken way of meeting current dangers to deny that there is any power on earth to remit sin at all? Will it not be better and safer to enlarge our whole conception of absolution, and, instead of denying that a Priest has any right or power to absolve, to realize that the duty of absolving, that is of remitting sins, is “inherent in the whole body as one of the main incidents of its collective priestliness.” If so, we must next examine the manner in which this duty of remitting sins is administered by the body to whom it was entrusted, and here we are at once struck with the fact

that under certain circumstances any baptized layman can exercise the priestly function of the Society and administer a very real absolution. For there is no real doubt of the validity, however irregular it may be, of lay baptism if administered with water in the name of the Trinity, and that baptism is a means of remission of sins can be doubted by no man who remembers St. Peter's words: "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," and the words of Ananias to St. Paul: "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord."

As we examine further we find that the whole ministry of the Church is a ministry of reconciliation, and that is of necessity a ministry of absolution, by which God's pardon comes to the penitent soul. Baptism is but the initial stage. By it we are transferred from a condition represented in type by the slavery in Egypt to a condition represented in type by the freedom of the Israelites when they had crossed the Red Sea, and the Egyptians were drowned. And this initial absolution carries with it the right and promise of all needed further absolution, the one condition of which is penitence. "Even in baptism" (that I may quote from Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures), "the general order of "the Church confines the usual and orderly administration of "the Sacrament to the Clergy, while to the Bishops alone is "given the power of completing, by laying on of hands, the "irregular and imperfect gift when given by lay or other "unauthorized agency. But all the other methods of Divine "forgiveness, subsequent to that of Baptism, in so far "as they are conveyed through human agency to those who "are by baptism made capable of receiving them, are with- "out exception, delivered to the Clergy, Bishops, and Priests, "under the original charter of the words of the Lord," acting, let me add, as the Divinely appointed organ of the Divine

Society, to which as a whole the right and duty of remitting sins was forgiven. How then are the Clergy to exercise this ministry? surely they exercise it first in the ordinary services of the Church. The absolution in morning and evening prayer is everywhit as effectual to the penitent and appropriating soul as the direct absolution in the visitation of the sick. Then in the Holy Communion, just as the repelling a notorious offender is a retaining of sin with a view to after repentance and pardon, so not only in the words of absolution after the confession, but in the actual administration is the pardon of a penitent soul sealed, for it is the application to the soul which can by faith receive it of the Blood shed for many for the remission of sins. More than this, every faithful ministry is in every detail of its working a ministry of absolution, bringing home to the soul in various ways the reality of sin and the equal reality of God's pardon in and for the sake of Jesus Christ, and encouraging that soul to remember that there is a true personal priesthood whereby every Christian has a free access to God in Jesus Christ. What then is the nature of the confession and absolution allowed in the Communion Service and the visitation of the sick? It is remedial and exceptional. The burdened man who cannot quiet his own conscience (and no other one should think of applying for such a remedy), and who requires further comfort or counsel is exhorted in the Communion Service to come to the Priest who reads the exhortation "or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's word and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution together with ghostly counsel and advice." You will notice the emphasising of the Pastoral Office in the administration of absolution. The sick man "if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter" (and to none other does the advice apply), is to be moved to

make a special confession of his sin, and “if he humbly and “heartily desire it,” the Priest is to exercise his ministry of absolution in the most direct and authoritative form. What can be plainer than that the Church of England considers the whole ministry to be a ministry of absolution, that on an emergency the initial step may be however irregularly, taken by any baptised layman, that the Clergy are bound to apply it by Sacrament, preaching, pastoral dealings in ordinary and special services, and that provision must be made for the more special absolution to the burdened soul which it would be cruel in such a case to withhold. It is not by denying the power of remitting sins that we are to cure an admitted evil, but by enlarging our whole idea of what absolution means, and placing the private absolution in its proper place as an exceptional remedy to be used by those who are empowered and have the experience to do so.

But if this be true, then I would make these three remarks: First, it would be absolutely wrong to bring the smallest pressure on any man or woman to make any special confession of sin unless there be an admitted burden on the conscience. Anything like pressure brought to bear on candidates for Confirmation—I believe there is none in this diocese—would be reprehensible in the highest degree.

Secondly, the very object of the special confession and absolution is to quiet the conscience and thus make the ordinary methods afterwards to suffice, so that, while I admit that there must be variety because of varying circumstances, still, as Bishop Moberly wisely says, “The practice of continual confession to a priest, and the craving for continual “absolution at his hands, much more the habit of seeking “constant ‘direction’ as it is called, of conscience from him, “has a distinctly enfeebling effect upon the personal strength “with which a Christian ought to learn to walk before God, “and to order his steps according to His law.”

Thirdly, the exercise of the special and more difficult ministry of absolution should not ordinarily be entrusted to young and inexperienced Priests. It is no necessary part of the exercise of the ministry of remitting sins, and I strongly advise incumbents to keep this more difficult work in their own hands, until they are sure that a young man after his ordination to the Priesthood will not make serious mistakes.

I have thus attempted to deal with a thorny question of controversy by showing you the place of private confession in the whole ministry of absolution, and I shall be thankful indeed, if I have helped any one to thank God the more for the wise, scriptural and primitive line which our Church has taken, in spite of the efforts made on the one hand to bind the Church with a chain of inflexible discipline in private confession and absolution, and on the other to abandon wholly what burdened souls have found to be a real comfort and blessing.

I shall deal more briefly with the other two subjects which have been agitating somewhat the public mind.

(b) Would it not be better before discussing the question of sacrifice in connection with the Holy Communion, to define terms?

Among the Jews there were offerings of two kinds, the sin and the trespass offerings, which were of a propitiatory character, and offerings of a sweet savour which had no idea of propitiation at all, of which were the burnt offering, the meat or meal offering, and the peace offering. Each offering was a type of Christ, but in a different way. Each finds something to correspond with it in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In respect of propitiation for sin, let our language be plain and clear. One sacrifice and one only could atone for sin, and that was offered on Calvary. Of

Holy Communion.

this, the Holy Communion is the memorial. I cannot put it better than in the words of Dr. Bright's well-known hymn :

“And now, O Father, mindful of the love,
That bought us once for all on Calvary's tree,
And having with us Him that pleads above,
We here present, we here spread forth to Thee,
That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
The one true pure immortal sacrifice.”

Undoubtedly unguarded words have been used which I deplore, seeming to imply that the sacrifice of Calvary needed the Eucharist to complete it. Hear Bishop Moberly again :

“Shall I ask whether the feast which they then celebrate is or is not a sacrifice? Brethren bear with me while I venture to say that I am not very careful, so far as I can judge, to answer the question. Indeed it appears to me to be little more than a question of words, which bears upon no important issue. The feast is what it is—and whether that is or is not what constitutes a sacrifice must depend altogether upon the precise meaning attached to the word sacrifice, and the definition given to it. There are surely good and innocent senses in which it may well and rightly be so called; there surely is a sense, the highest, that in which the actual offering of the Lord's Body and Blood upon the altar of the Cross was once offered, the only full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world in which we may not dare so to call it.” Let us then be quite clear that in respect to the propitiation the Holy Communion is the memorial of the one sacrifice and cannot in any sense be said to be propitiation itself. When I hear it said that “Do this” *must* mean “offer this” in memory of Me, I cannot help regretting that good scholarship should be clouded over by Theological proclivities. It is not improbable that the word may have some allusion to its use in connection

with offerings, but the great Greek scholars would never dare to translate it in any other way than "Do."

But as Bishop Moberly says there are other good and innocent senses in which the Holy Communion is undoubtedly sacrificial. The burnt offering in which the victim was wholly consumed had no relation to sin at all but symbolized the entire consecration of the offerer to God. And so in this Holy Sacrament we "offer and present ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice." The peace offering had nothing to do with sin, but being an offering in which Priest and offerer shared with God (the part consumed being always considered God's share), betokened communion between God, the Priest, and the offerer, and finds its counterpart to the Christian precisely in His Holy Sacrament, in which "we are one with Christ and Christ with us." And so any special acts of sacrifice on our part are fitly made in connection with this Holy Communion. We offer of our substance as well as our souls and bodies, and some of the chief acts of personal dedication to God have been sealed in this Holy Service. Would it not be well, therefore, carefully to define terms before we say whether the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is or is not sacrificial, and would it not be well always to try to find points of agreement, and to avoid language which is provocative and liable to be misunderstood?

This only would I say that I do not see how anyone can be said to take part in this memorial of our Lord's sacrifice who does not actually communicate. It is "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." There is a real danger lest persons should believe that they can sever the act of sacrifice (if we use this term in one of its innocent senses) or the act of worship from the act of communion. I am wholly unable to sever the two. And therefore I could

never encourage what is called "non-communicating attendance," except in certain circumstances which are not normal but exceptional and need not be considered here. In early days there was very frequent communion, but it was real communion. The danger now is lest we relapse into frequent attendance but infrequent reception, and it appears to me that all the blessing of the Sacrament is bound up with the receiving. I need hardly say, therefore, that I think that "Children's Eucharists" which have been introduced in some churches in England, though I know of none amongst us, are full of grave danger. There is surely a sacred reserve in teaching these holy mysteries, and I am unable to believe that young children can as a rule realise a spiritual presence other than in a very material form.

On the doctrine of the Presence itself, indeed, I trust the Church of England will always be as inclusive and comprehensive as is possible within defined limits. On the one hand she alleges that transubstantiation destroys the nature of a sacrament; on the other she maintains that it is no mere "sign of the love that Christians ought to have "among themselves, but rather . . . a partaking of the Body "and Blood of Christ." But between these two limits she lays down no law as to the method of the Presence. The belief that it is confined to the heart of the believer, and the belief that it is irrespective of the heart of the recipient, have been loyally and reverently held continuously in the Church of England by devout men and great theologians, and I am wholly unwilling to narrow the Church down to one statement to the exclusion of the other. But those who hold what is called the objective view are bound to hold that the Presence is wholly spiritual, and can only be received by the spiritual mouth of the soul, faith, so that in no sense whatever can the wicked be said to receive the Body and Blood of Christ. These are offered and given to them sacrament-

ally, but having no spiritual mouth they cannot receive them ; they receive simply the Sacrament and nothing more. Those who hold the subjective view are bound equally to hold that it is through the means of Sacrament that their faith receives the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ. There is surely a holy reserve in dealing with these great mysteries, and the devout soul will grow as he faithfully communicates. Nothing can be more painful than the way in which controversialists have dealt with these mysteries in the press, as though it were possible simply to teach as a matter of philosophy what requires the devout meditation of a soul that adores his Lord. But I urge my brethren of the clergy to remember this reserve in their reverent teaching of the doctrine of the Holy Communion, and to believe that however people may differ as to their statement of the doctrine, there is far more real agreement between Christian men, when they draw near with faith to this Holy Sacrament, than the world supposes. I urge them to avoid the use of words and phrases which are not in the Prayer Book, and not authorized, such as the word "mass," which, besides being unmeaning in itself, is associated in the public mind with ideas which the Church has deliberately put aside. I urge them to be careful in defining terms, to realize the great comprehensiveness of the Church of England, to seek to promote more frequent and more earnest reception of this blessed Sacrament, and to avoid as far as possible controversial teaching in what they give to their flocks.

On the third subject—prayers for the dead—my words must be few. Mediæval superstition and Protestant prejudice have so obscured the Scriptural and primitive view of the state of the faithful departed that only gradually has truer teaching been received. Let us say plainly that of the state of the departed we know very little indeed, and that a natural curiosity makes us all wish to know more. This

Prayers for
the dead.

curiosity some have not scrupled to satisfy by adding traditions which cannot in any way be proved by the Word of God. Neither the New Testament nor the Church of England have ever forbidden prayers for the dead, as has been pointed out by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but the Archbishop went on to say, "Nevertheless, it (the Church) "does not authorise the introduction of such prayers into our "public worship except in the most cautious and guarded "manner." The silence of Scripture is a matter for study. On the one hand, it is certain that the Jews prayed for the dead, and that the early Church would receive this heritage unless forbidden in the word of God, and there is nothing to forbid, while there are two obscure passages which may possibly slightly illustrate the position. On the other hand, it is significant that as the New Testament is so explicit as to the duty, nature, and condition of prayer, and in mention of various persons for whom prayer should be offered there should be nothing but an obscure reference to a possibly dead man, Onesiphorus, and to certain souls below the altar in the Revelation, to teach the duty of praying for those who are gone.

The Early Church prayed not for a change of state after death to the impenitent, but for peace, light, and refreshment for the faithful dead, and I would that men had rested contented with this! To do this was to satisfy the natural instincts of the Christian, and to realise communion with those beyond the veil. But on this basis men in later years built such a superstructure of purgatory with its system of indulgences and claim on the part of the Church here to control in some measure the next world, that, in the Reformation settlement, it was not thought safe in public worship even to revert to the restrained language of more primitive times. There we must loyally leave it. We have no right to teach anything as an Article of Faith that

cannot be proved by Holy Scripture. In our private and family worship we may linger lovingly in prayer (but with guarded reserve and acknowledging our ignorance, which for some wise purpose God must have allowed) in communion with the faithful ones whom we have known and loved and lost for the time. In our public worship we must be still more restrained. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God and there shall no torment touch them." We may thank God for their example and pray that we "with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in God's eternal and everlasting glory."

Conclusion

I have offered you, my brethren of the clergy and laity, with perfect frankness, and in the hope of a better mutual understanding in the Church, what are my own convictions on these controversial matters. But let me close by stating that I believe that the matters in which Churchmen are agreed are infinitely greater and more important than those in which they differ. I am quite persuaded that this controversy, despite its painful incidents, will tend to the better understanding of the wonderful position which God in His Providence has called our Church to occupy. Already I see signs of calmer counsels, of disputes turned to deeper study of the word of God and to prayer, and of a great over-ruling of present troubles. What is essential is time for all that is spiritual to develop. Law courts and repression by law are the last things to which a Church should have recourse. We are Christian men who desire to know the will of God and to do it. I am persuaded that the Church will rise the stronger and purer to do her real work of winning the people to the faith and obedience of Christ.

CHARGE,

DELIVERED IN S. JAMES' CHURCH, MORPETH, ON
THE FIRST DAY OF JUNE, 1899.

III.—THE CHURCH IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATE.

THE Church in England is so intertwined with the body politic that the functions of the State affect us and come into contact with us at every turn of life. To any student of English history this is natural and plain, and while some good men conscientiously desire an entire severance between the Church and the State, most of us feel that our position is Providential and unique, that it hallows the English nation, and that, provided there be a due recognition of the legitimate claims of the State on the one hand and the Church on the other, the severance which some propose would weaken the religious life of the people and leave ills and wrongs for which the expected gains would be no adequate compensation. It is not as though at some period of history the State had invented and established by law a religious society which is called the Church of England. It is rather that in primitive days Christian missionaries from Iona and from Rome, after the almost complete suppression of early British Christianity by Saxon heathen invaders, re-evangelised this land and planted the standard of the Cross so firmly that the unity of the Church led to the unity of the Nation, the Councils of the Church became the model on which the English Parliament was based, the Church indeed lending the very hall in which Parliament first met, and thenceforth the Church became one of the great factors of English life. I need not follow in detail the wonderful

Growth of
the Church
Its
unbroken
continuity.

vicissitudes of the Church's history. The great fact to remember is that from first to last it has been one and the same Church with unbroken continuity. Even between the Norman Conquest and the sixteenth century, when the Roman yoke was heaviest, there were abundant assertions of independent national Church life, and the political events of the sixteenth century were rather the occasion than the cause of the great change which then ensued. Since the Reformation settlement, which took final shape in 1662, there has been abundant proof of the continuity which the Church has never ceased to assert. There has been no break whatever in order of ministry, due administration of Sacrament, transmission of the faith once delivered to the saints though purged from mediæval accretion, and historical Church assemblies. Law has all along regulated and established, in the sense of making firm, but has never claimed to have originated anything spiritual, or to do more than find orderly expression for the Church's spiritual life. The laws of the Church have gradually been incorporated with and become a part of the laws of the land, and hence in all our development, so absolutely necessary amid the changes of centuries, we find ourselves working within the sphere of law.

I propose to-day to offer some observations on the life of the Church as it is especially brought into contact with the State, and that in respect of the clergy, the churches, the people, and the government of the Church.

I. The method whereby the cure of souls is intrusted to a clergyman, by presentation to a Bishop and admission by a Bishop, his status as an incumbent, his responsibility for the care of the house in which he lives, the discipline under which he works, the courts before which he is liable to have to give account, are all regulated by law and have been affected by more or less recent legislation. clergy.

(a) The Benefices Act, which came into force on 1st January last, has largely affected the question of Patronage. I welcome it as an instalment of much needed reform. Hereafter no advowson can be sold by public auction except it be part of an estate which is sold with it. Every benefice of private patronage has to be registered publicly in the Diocesan Registry; the sale of next presentations is absolutely forbidden; the powers of a Bishop to refuse to institute or admit a clergyman to a benefice are (for the benefit of the parishes) considerably enlarged: "donatives," which were before largely independent of Episcopal jurisdiction, and some of which gave ground for no little scandal in respect to the sale of advowsons, have been changed into presentative benefices; and, as a safeguard against any abuse of the enlarged powers given to a Bishop in respect of admission to benefices, an appeal is allowed to the Archbishop of the Province and a Judge of the Supreme Court. I cannot doubt the wisdom of these reforms. They were desired by the clergy in general and not merely by the laity. It is hard to defend the sale of advowsons at all, and it is only the good sense and conscientious action of patrons in general that have made our English custom work as satisfactorily as it has, but the new Act has swept away all the main abuses and has probably gone as far as it was safe and wise to go, and the traffic in benefices has received a severe blow, which speaks well for the quickened conscience of Church and people.

It is well, however, to point out that, strictly speaking, patrons present incumbents to the Bishop and not to benefices. The Bishop alone, as the chief shepherd of a diocese, has the power to confer cure of souls, and he does it on the nomination or presentation of the authorised patron of the living, after due enquiry as to the fitness of the nominee for the charge, the grounds on which he is justified in not

accepting the nomination being now clearly stated in the new Act. I think it important that this should be brought out in admitting a clergyman to a benefice, as it surely gives him a higher sense of vocation than if he were merely nominated by a patron who might have little other connection with the parish.

(b) The status of the incumbent so appointed varies in different parishes, and as I have found some confusion on this point, and there has been in the past some irregularity in the official records of this diocese and that of the mother diocese of Durham, I think it well to give a memorandum, drawn up at my request by the learned chancellor of the diocese, on the title Rector, Vicar, and Perpetual Curate.

(b) Legal status of Incumbents. Memorandum by the Chancellor.

MEMORANDUM.

“The idea, which is somewhat prevalent, that if the Incumbent of a new parish is endowed with some tithe he is entitled to call himself ‘Rector’ is an erroneous one. Some new parishes (there are five on North Tyne) have been constituted by special local acts which have provided that the Incumbents are to be ‘Rectors.’ There is also a provision in 58 George III., Cap. 45, Secs. 16 and 19, under which parishes may be divided into two parts, and the Rector, Vicar, or Perpetual Curate be converted into two Rectors, Vicars, or Perpetual Curates. Under 3 George IV., Cap. 72, Secs. 13 and 14, certain Vicarages may be converted into Rectories by the surrender of lay impropriations or sinecure Rectories for that purpose. There is furthermore a provision in the statute 19 and 20 Vic., Cap. 104, sec. 26, (Lord Blandford’s Act) that on the constitution of a new parish or district, a re-settlement of the Glebe lands tithe rent, charges, and other endowments, may be made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and upon any such settlement wherever the *whole* of the Ecclesiastical dues arising within the parish or district consisting of any

rectorial or praedial tithes shall become payable to the Incumbent, such parish shall become a Rectory and the Incumbent a 'Rector.' For a short period, viz: from June 19th, 1865 to July 31st, 1868, a statute, 28 Vic., Cap. 42, Sec. 1, (District Church Tithes Act) was in force, which enabled the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in cases where any tithes arising within a parish were transferred to the Incumbent, to declare that his Benefice should be either a Rectory or Vicarage as they thought fit. This statute was, however, repealed on July 31st, 1868, and the power it gave no longer exists. In the foregoing cases the Incumbents are, by law, constituted 'Rectors' and 'Vicars' and not mere 'Titular Rectors' or 'Titular Vicars.' The Incumbents of most new parishes are perpetual curates, and the possession of some Rectorial or Vicarial endowments does not alter their legal status and make them legally 'Rectors' or 'Vicars,' but if they have districts legally assigned, with consecrated Churches, in which districts and Churches they can legally perform all the offices of the Church and are entitled to all the fees arising from the performance without reservation to the Incumbents of the mother parishes, they are entitled by Bishop S. Wilberforce's Act, 31 and 32 Vic., Cap. 117, Sec. 2, 'for the purpose of style and designation, but not for any other purpose' to be called 'Vicars,' and this is therefore their correct designation. There is no corresponding right to the term 'Rector.' "

It is really of very little consequence whether a Clergyman be called Rector, Vicar, or Incumbent. It does not in any way affect his cure of souls, and I am always careful, in admitting to benefices, which I am thankful to be able to do almost invariably in the presence of parishioners, and in the Church where the new incumbent serves, to point out that the admission has precisely the same spiritual effect

and meaning whatever the title may be. There is no sort of inferiority in the position of Perpetual Curate, who perhaps from the marriage or burial fees, in whole or in part, still being reserved for a time to the incumbent of the mother Church, is not legally entitled to the courtesy title of "Vicar,"—which, by Bishop S. Wilberforce's Act (31 & 32 Vict. c. 117), may be assumed at once by Perpetual Curates of "new parishes" under Lord Blandford's Act (19 & 20 Vict. c. 104)—to the position of the most ancient Rector in the land. They are spiritually in full cure of souls under the ordinary. And yet there should be an accurate statement of the legal title. I have found that, in perfect faith, simply following the custom of their immediate predecessors, no fewer than nine incumbents of the Diocese have taken the title of "Rector," and two of them have been instituted as Rectors, although, in one case, the benefice was declared a Vicarage in 1866 under the "District Church Titles Act" (28 Vic. c. 42, sec. 9), and in every other case the benefice was a Perpetual Curacy and titular Vicarage. You will observe from the Chancellor's memorandum there is no such thing as a titular "Rectory," though, by Bishop Wilberforce's Act, there may be a titular Vicarage, and such, indeed, is the status of about half the benefices of this Diocese. The Chancellor has referred to the "District Church Tithes Act," which was only in force for three years. Strangely enough, there was no record in the Registry of Durham of the parishes which, under the operation of this Act, had become Rectories or Vicarages—not (observe) titular Vicarages, but as full Vicarages as any ancient parish. I have ascertained, however, from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, that, in the years 1866, 1867, and 1868, St. John Lee, Throckington, Wallsend, Allendale, and Hexham were declared Rectories, and Tweedmouth, Carham, Cornhill, Bamburgh, Horton, Shotley, Widdrington,

Duddo, Cambo, and Matfen were declared Vicarages. Such was the confusion in respect to Cornhill, that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners write to me : "Cornhill appears "to have been erroneously styled a Rectory in more than "one document to which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners "were a party. These mistakes were entirely due to "inadvertence, and in no wise alter the fact that the cure "is, as it was declared to be in 1866, a Vicarage." In every one of the nine cases in which the title "Rector" has been by error assumed, the present incumbent is entirely blameless. In two cases, Cornhill and Whittonstall, the mistake was made in institution. In the others (Amble, Chevington, Acklington, Newton Hall, Byrness, Gosforth, and Willington-on-Tyne) it does not occur in the act of admission, but the title was assumed by predecessors of the present incumbents in the mistaken idea that endowment by great tithe conferred it. But I have submitted the whole case to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Chancellor, with the result that I have stated. In two of these cases (Amble and Willington) the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, after considering the point, have expressly described each as a Vicarage in a recent order in Council effecting an exchange of patronage. It is a very small matter indeed—merely one of a name in which there has been no shadow of any attempt to claim what was not legal, but it is well that in future we should know the accurate legal designation of every benefice in the Diocese.

One point indeed I desire to make plain. When on the repeal of the District Church Tithes Act in 1868, Bishop S. Wilberforce introduced and carried his short act, by which incumbents of "New parishes," as they are technically called under the operation of Lord Blandford's act (19 and 20 Vict., C. 104, Sec. 26), were entitled to be called Vicars by courtesy, he never intended to place a heavy financial burden on every

Vicars of
new parishes
licensed
and
admitted,
not
instituted.

incumbent thenceforth to be admitted to such a benefice. The fees on licensing and admitting a Perpetual Curate are much smaller than those on instituting a Rector or Vicar of an ancient parish. But the custom grew up of "instituting," these titular Vicars instead of licensing and admitting them, and so of imposing higher fees. This custom still prevails in some dioceses. In others, incumbents have the option of being "instituted" or "licensed." In this diocese and others they have no option at all. I will be no party to the imposition of this higher fee. I license and admit every incumbent who is entitled to be called a Vicar by courtesy, and the clergy may trust me that I take care to explain to parishioners that the spiritual act is precisely the same and that there is no atom of inferiority. The words of the license are almost exactly the same as the form of institution. There is the mere variation of the word. But no "induction" (i.e. admission to temporalities by the Archdeacon or his deputy) is required after licensing as the license carries both. Every Rector and every Vicar of an ancient parish (those declared Vicarages under the District Church Tithes Act coming into this category), requires to be instituted and inducted.

(c) When admitted to benefices most incumbents have to live in and keep up and insure parsonage houses, and I simply want to place on record here my sense of the frequent hard working of the Dilapidation Acts. I sincerely hope that a bill which is being considered by laymen in the diocese of London may be introduced, whereby some annual charge may be imposed on a benefice for repairs of the glebe property, and some central office (perhaps Queen Anne's Bounty) may undertake responsibility for repairs. The sections of such a bill will require to be carefully drawn, but the present act frequently operates very hardly on a family on the death of an incumbent, and sometimes hardly

(c)
Parsonages
Dilapida-
tion.

on his successor and on a parish if he die without sufficient estate to discharge the dilapidation.

(d)
Clergy
Discipline.
Clergy
Discipline
Act, 1892.
Benefices
Act, 1898.

(d) In matters of clergy discipline perhaps it will be well for me to say that since the last episcopal visitation two most important Acts have effected a considerable change. By the Clergy Discipline Act, 1892, the proceedings formerly needed to try a clergyman on a charge of immorality or grave offences were greatly shortened and simplified, and the Act has worked very well. Such cases are happily few, but there was an universal feeling in the Church that she should have power through her courts to free parishes of incumbents of proved unworthy life. The Benefices Act of 1898 has introduced a further reform. A commission appointed by the Bishop under the Pluralities Act and the Pluralities Act Amendment Act, increased as it must now be by two additional laymen, nominated usually by the chairman of Quarter Sessions, can now take cognisance of any wilful default in respect of the observance of the promises as to conduct which every clergyman solemnly makes at the time of his ordination. And a Bishop is able (subject to appeal) if the commission report adversely, to appoint a curate in charge of the parish and inhibit the incumbent.

Church
Courts on
Ritual and
Doctrine.

These acts in no way touch questions of ritual and doctrine, and I have no intention of dealing with the reform of Ecclesiastical Courts needed to consider such matters to-day. We are still in the stage of conference and deliberation. A draft bill, drawn at the request of the late Archbishop Benson, has been laid before the two Convocations and two Houses of Laymen as the basis of further action, and until matters have reached a later stage I prefer to be silent. My silence, moreover, will the better harmonise with my conviction that while our Church courts *must* be reformed if they are to win the entire confidence of the Church and

the public, our great need now is the development of a spiritual process whereby many of our present evils will be removed without any recourse to courts of law at all. Violent repression, however necessary at times, is a poor remedy for spiritual troubles. We need to examine the causes which underlie the disquiet to which I referred yesterday, and patiently to teach principles and inspire a loyalty which shall make recourse to Church courts in matters of doctrine and ritual exceptional and rare.

II. As to the Churches, I shall detain you but a few minutes. But I desire to impress on clergy and churchwardens the great responsibility which rests on them in reference to the preservation of the fabric, and the comfort, health, and facilities for worship, of the parishioners who attend the services. Pardon me if I say that I have been profoundly impressed with the conviction that the insurance of very many Churches is far too low. Fires in Churches are terrible calamities, and are happily rare. But they do occur, and there is little public sympathy with the parish if the building is inadequately insured. I am thankful to say that, according to the returns, no Churches or glebe-houses are uninsured. But I find that 42 Churches are insured for sums of £1000 or under, one being actually insured for £200, and 63 are insured for sums between £2000 and £1000. When I think that each additional £100 means only about 1/6 per annum, that there is a very serious risk if the sum insured be not adequate substantially to rebuild the Church, and that all the profits of the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Office, started largely by the efforts of that admirable layman whom the Church so lately lost, Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode, return to the Church herself, I cannot help hoping that vicars and churchwardens will carefully consider the adequacy of the insurance. Many of our Churches in Northumberland are of the deepest historical interest, and on all

II.—
Churches'
Insurance.

accounts we should treasure them and leave nothing undone that prudence requires.

Faculties.

On the question of faculties, I desire to reproduce the subjoined extract from a charge given by the learned Chancellor to the churchwardens of the diocese, in 1891:—"For
 "mere repairs it is not necessary that you should obtain the
 "authority of a Faculty nor can you insist that those who
 "seek to repair monuments to the memory of their ancestors
 "shall first obtain such a Faculty. You are bound to grant
 "leave unhampered by any such condition. Indeed, it is
 "your duty rather to encourage the repair of monuments
 "than to throw obstacles in the way. If, however, you
 "desire to effect any alterations in the church, whether
 "in the structure itself—walls, roof, or windows—or in the
 "seats, stalls, reading-desk, pulpit, or other fixtures, it is
 "your plain duty, first, to obtain the requisite legal
 "authority, a Faculty. In some matters of lesser moment,
 "such as the erection of ordinary tablets, the Ecclesiastical
 "Courts, while distinctly affirming the principle that in
 "strictness a Faculty is needed even in their case, have con-
 "sidered that where they are conveniently placed and there
 "is no opposition, the sanction of the Parson would be
 "sufficient. The courts are not hungry for jurisdiction in
 "these matters. But such cases are to be regarded as
 "exceptional, and in general it is clear that no one, be he
 "Rector, Vicar, or Churchwarden, has the right to effect
 "any alteration in the structure or fixtures of a Church
 "without first laying before the Bishop's Chancellor the
 "details of what he proposes to do, and obtaining his
 "sanction. Such sanction will not be granted until after
 "the proposals have been carefully considered, in order to
 "ascertain whether they comply with the provisions of the
 "law, and until an opportunity has been afforded to those
 "who object to appear and state reasons why the alterations

“should not be sanctioned. I do not think I can urge upon you too strongly the importance of a strict observance of this requirement of the law.”

And my last word on the matter of Churches shall be this. The laws of health are the laws of God, and I do hope that one of the chief requirements in churches and mission buildings of the future will be that in matters of ventilation, lighting, and heating, the ascertained laws of science shall be observed. Vitiating air hinders worship, endangers health, and is scarcely worthy of a Christian in a building dedicated to the service of God. I would far rather sacrifice some ornamentation in architecture than be responsible for any violation of sanitary laws, and I feel that not enough attention has been paid in matters of religion to these very necessary matters. I am certain that our laity will co-operate with the clergy in making good any deficiencies of former days.

Laws of health.

There is no fresh legislation in the matter of Churches or mission buildings, but as the question of trusts for parochial buildings and mission chapels is often raised, I wish to draw renewed attention to the fact that our Diocesan Society is Incorporated, and able to hold property, and that each year an increasing number of parishes takes advantage of the admirable service which it may do in this way to the Diocese at large.

Trusts.

III. Passing from clergy and churches to the laity as they are affected by the state in matters which concern religion, I feel that I ought to speak to you on questions of education, marriage and burial.

The Laity.

(a) EDUCATION.

Since I came amongst you a most important education act has been passed which has had two good results. It has met present needs, and has had a most valuable effect in bringing the schools to be associated together. The

(a) Education.

Newcastle Diocesan Association of Schools has worked smoothly, and I think effectively, with the aid of its unwearied secretary, and largely by the co-operation of its Ruri-decanal committees. It has received the warm commendation of the Education Department. It has taught churchmen the value of common action in matters of elementary education, and while it is a Diocesan Association, it has received into its ranks many schools not definitely connected with our Church, and has thereby united in defence of voluntary schools a wider body than churchmen alone. I am convinced that this association was the very thing needed to bring the schools into line, to level up the weaker and less efficient schools, to bring the sympathy and resources of the stronger to aid the weaker, and I desire to press upon the Diocese the necessity of maintaining the Diocesan Inspection Fund, a sub-fund of our Diocesan Society, in full efficiency, as a fund most necessary for the due security of the religious teaching in all our schools. But I cannot disguise from myself the truth that the education problem has only received a temporary solution. Personally I have in no way receded from the position which I took before this act was passed. The North of England strongly favoured rate aid as the ultimate solution of the elementary school problem, and I should be quite prepared to accept representation of rate-payers on the boards of management on suitable terms. But the feeling of the country generally was not ripe for this solution, and we must quietly hold our own, and maintain our voluntary schools as efficiently as we can. I welcome heartily the proposed reform of the Education Department, and I look forward to fresh legislation on the subject of secondary education. It will probably be necessary after this to revert to the problems which our elementary education offers, and to work again for their solution.

(b) MARRIAGE.

(b) Marriage.
Divorce.
Deceased
Wife's
Sister.

I could not be wholly silent on a subject in which Church and State are brought into such close contact as marriage. But I intend to reserve to another occasion hereafter what it may be needful to say on the question of divorce. It would be impossible to treat this matter adequately in the time at my disposal, and other matters have pressed into a more prominent place for the time. But no one can fail to see that on the one hand there are serious differences in the Church herself as to what our Lord Himself allows and what the Church has sanctioned, and on the other that, whatever these differences may be, the State itself in the Divorce Act did most dangerously infringe upon the prerogative of the Church. The State has power to make regulations for marriage as a most important civil rite. It has no moral power to do violence to the convictions of churchmen and alter the Church's law without her consent. The State would never have attempted this had there been, at the time of framing the Divorce Act, the strong feeling which has grown of more recent years, and the fact that the Church practically, for a long time, seemed to condone what had been done, must make us very patient in seeking a remedy now. I decline, without going fully into the matter, to express further opinions as to the extent of the State's infringement and as to what ought to be done. The question must come up for solution when present emergencies have passed away.

But this is not the only difficulty. I view with serious concern the efforts made to alter the law as to marriage with a deceased's wife sister. The principles on which the present marriage law is based is that the relations of one of the contracting parties are the relations of the other, and if this principle is violated in one case I do not see how it can stop there. I simply touch on these matters now with a

feeling that they will give us serious trouble in the not distant future, and that we shall need great wisdom in dealing with them.

(c) BURIALS.

(c) Burials.

On the question of the Burial Laws I shall trouble you in rather more detail. My last act in the spring of last year before my very serious illness was to give evidence before a committee of the House of Commons on the revision of the Burial Laws, and I most entirely endorse the main recommendations of the report accepted with striking unanimity by a committee equally divided in political sympathies. When men meet together with the real wish to remove grievances and solve difficulties they can often come to terms. In the present case both sides, if I may say so, had wrongs to be righted. I have long felt—I felt it when a part of my income came from this very source—that I could not defend the custom of incumbents receiving fees in cemeteries provided by the rates on any other principle than that of payment for services rendered. Such fees must be adequate (and frequently they are not, the real remuneration coming from fees for vaults, headstones, &c.), and should be collected for clergy and all ministers by the Burial authority, and regularly paid by the authority to those concerned. But after providing for vested interests other fees should cease. Nor could I defend the principle of providing two chapels out of the rates for every small cemetery that might be formed, and, as by the Parish Councils Act any parish council may become the Burial Board and provide a cemetery, we are likely to have a great increase of small cemeteries in the future. I felt that it might be fairly left to any religious body that required it to provide a chapel for its own exclusive use, and I remembered that I had lived four years in a land where burials took place in cemeteries without any chapel at all. The question of fees

and Chapels I knew to be felt as grievances, and I thought they injured the Church's work by keeping up a sense of wrong. On the other hand I felt that churchmen had a very real grievance, and chiefly under the Marten Act, of which increasing use was being made by Urban or Rural District Councils. For under this Act the provisions of an Act framed in 1847 for a totally different purpose, viz., for regulating commercial cemeteries,—the Cemetery Clauses Act—were to be applied to a totally different set of circumstances. Boards of Guardians, now District Councils, were able to decide the important question affecting religious disabilities, whether churchmen and others who had always had the right of laying their dead in consecrated ground were to retain the right any longer, and, moreover, though only a single parish might pay for the burial ground, this question which involved a religious disability to so many people was to be decided by the representatives of the whole district and not by the parish alone.

The result of the committee's deliberations have been the issue of a report which seems to me to meet and remove every real grievance, and on which the Home Secretary has promised to base a bill, which is equally desired on both sides of the House of Commons. I offer no opinion on the purely departmental question—which government department should in future be in charge of this work. There has certainly been confusion hitherto in the fact that most cemeteries are under the Home Office, while all under Marten's Act are under the Local Government Board. But in the provision of a simple intelligible burial authority, in the settling of the question of fees or chapels on the lines which I have already indicated, in the practical repeal of Marten's Act, in providing that, if the Local Authority do not apply for consecration, the central Government Department may do so at the request of any reasonable

number of parishioners, in the significant retention of the existing authority of the ordinary in all consecrated ground—an authority which has proved an unequalled guarantee of security against any profane use of the ground, or any unseemly practices—in all these main features of the report I see a practical settlement of all existing grievances. The Bishop of Durham, in seconding a resolution which I moved in the Upper House of York Convocation and which was unanimously carried, to the effect that the report was a satisfactory basis for legislation, remarked that such a solution would have removed all the difficulties with which in these matters he has had to deal, and I cannot but rejoice that the good sense of a House of Commons Committee has given us such promise of a satisfactory settlement of difficulties that have divided parishes. It cannot be the interest of Christian men to have differences on matters so tenderly affecting us as the burial of our dead, and I hope that, if not this session at any rate the next, an act may be placed on the statute book which shall consolidate the Burial Laws and promote peace.

IV. There is one last point on which I wish to address words to the Diocese to-day before I pass from matters which touch our connection with the State, and it is the spiritual autonomy that the Church needs for the settlement of its affairs. At present we are necessarily limited by statutes in many directions, in which more liberty of action would stop a grievance or advance the Master's Kingdom. Whatever reforms of our Ecclesiastical Courts may be possible hereafter, and granted that we have courts which may command the fullest confidence of the Church, still courts can never do what the voice of the living Church can alone do, in meeting the fresh needs and dealing with the changing circumstances of successive generations. Self-adjustment is a right inherent in the divinely constituted

society called the Church of Christ, and self-adjustment is the necessity of any National Church. To have to exercise this right in every case through Parliament is at best a long and cumbersome process, and though Parliament is not averse as a rule to granting what the clergy and laity of the Church are really agreed in asking, yet the House of Commons has but little time for such legislation and no one can seriously maintain that it is a very fit body to have to deal with the great variety of questions which a really representative Church body would have to handle. What therefore we need is some power of self-adjustment, and for this purpose some greater spiritual autonomy. But this really depends on working out the question of the constitutional rights of the laity. The laity have a perfect right to take part with the clergy in the general administration of the Church. I thank God for the quickened life of the laity of to-day. Compared with what I remember as a young man, it shows a marked advance. But we must arrange for some orderly method whereby the laity may be associated with the clergy in the administration of the parish, the diocese, and the Church at large. We have the nucleus of such organization in our churchwardens and sidesmen, our members of ruri-decanal and afterwards of diocesan conferences, and our houses of laymen. But all these require to be co-ordinated and developed, and the crucial test of the whole matter is the qualification for elector and representative in the parish. When such parish has its real representatives it will not be difficult to go on to the Rural Deanery, the Diocese, the Province, and, I hope, to the co-operation of Provinces. It is the patient working out of this problem—the true place of the laity in council, which must go side by side with the working out of the parallel problem, the true place of the laity in the spiritual work of the Church, which will really solve the difficulty of Church government. It is

not likely that Parliament will concede greater power of Church government until it is plain that the Church has a really representative body, working up from the parish to the diocese and the province, to which such powers may be fitly given. Every diocese must take its share in working out this problem. I am thankful to meet the laity in Ruridecanal and Diocesan conferences, and yet I feel we need more real and more adequate representation and more general interest taken in the Church's work. Spiritual autonomy in some form is the great ideal at which we may aim, but we must labour, clergy and laity alike, to be worthy of it. We must have infinite patience in surmounting difficulties.

Our present constitution in Church and State is the result of centuries of English life. It is not lightly to be modified, even with a view to the greater efficiency of the Church's work. There must be a steady growth in public conviction issuing at last in fruitful legislation, and meanwhile we must patiently do the best we can even under the disadvantage of being only able to adjust ourselves to modern circumstances under the cumbersome process of Parliamentary legislation. It is marvellous to see what a growth there has been in the past half century, with all our drawbacks. The union of Church and State in England has grown up, and is not the work of any definite date. Great forbearance is needed on either side; the State respecting the rights and duties inherent in the society which our Lord planted, and which no State could ever create; and the Church, on her side, respecting the legitimate functions of the State in loyalty to the Sovereign and conformity to law. Gradually we shall see our way to further re-adjustments.

Each parishioner may hasten the result by taking a more intelligent interest in the Church work of his own parish. To weld together a diocese of such varied elements

as ours into one homogeneous whole is a task of difficulty but a task that inspires. Lindisfarne and Hexham bring up memories that challenge us to revive and excel the active Church life of those primitive days amid the changed circumstances of to-day, and what makes the idea of the organisation an inspiration is the knowledge that we work not for ourselves, but for our Master, and that the Church is "His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

CHARGE,

DELIVERED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF ALNWICK, ON
THE SECOND DAY OF JUNE, 1899.

IV.—CHURCH EXTENSION.

I HAVE so far dealt with Diocesan growth, with questions of controversy now being raised in the Church, and with certain points in which the Church is brought into contact, and sometimes into risk of collision, with the State. I propose, to-day, to deal with our duty as a Church in the future, apart from all questions of controversy. Here are we, the northernmost diocese of England, an integral part of the whole Church, bound to take our share in extending our Lord's Kingdom. How are we to do it?

(i.) The beginning of all Church extension in a parish should be found in the lives of the clergy. If the Parish Priest be not the centre of life and fire, where is it to be found? Hence, my brothers in the ministry, the unspeakable importance of all that concerns your own spiritual life. Our Lord ordained twelve men first, "that they should be with him," and, secondly, "that He might send them forth to preach." (Mark ii. 14.) He still only sends forth to preach those who are content to be with Him. The ministry that is absorbed in work and ignores devotion will soon be utterly barren, and, not improbably, in time will give up the work unless the tempter find that it is too convenient a snare by which his victim may be caught. I strongly recommend all wise and spiritual means whereby this inner life may be sustained. Retreats and Quiet Days are found helpful by most of us. For myself, it has been a matter of thankfulness to notice the yearly increase in the number

i.)—Stages
of Church
Extension.

lives of
clergy.

of curates of the diocese attending the Quiet Day which my predecessor wisely instituted at Benwell Tower. Last December about three-fourths of our whole number attended. The offer of beds on the previous night to all beyond Morpeth and Hexham has enabled the more distant curates to have the same advantages as those near at hand. I am most grateful to those kind friends who have helped me by conducting these Quiet Days. I took the first, in 1896, myself, and since that time we have had the Vicar of Leeds (Dr. Gibson) and the Bishop of Richmond, and death only prevented us from having the late beloved Bishop of Wakefield, Dr. Walsham How. I am convinced, too, that clerical meetings, Ruri-decanal chapters and conferences, and the like, all contribute to the maintenance of the high standard of life and work at which we are bound to aim. If we are not ourselves first afire we shall lack the power of firing others. "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." (Isaiah lii. 11.)

(ii.) I would say next to the Clergy—give your highest and deepest teaching to those able to influence others in turn. You may not be able to influence all alike, and in a large parish you certainly cannot, but you can so mould the character of some that they, fired with your zeal and equipped by your training, may carry your influence to fields that you can never reach yourself. We must never lose sight of the lesson that underlies the fact that our Lord seemed to neglect the multitude to train twelve men. If the Clergy will set themselves to equip as thoroughly as possible their church workers and communicants, the inner circle of those whose hearts are touched and whose heads are instructed will be continually expanding, and the society will be extending from the centre which is the only safe course. It is sometimes forgotten that the best Christian aggression is the attraction of a living Church.

(ii.)—The
Inner
Circle in
every
Parish.

A man may win and attract, but the society attracts far more. It is the expression of thought and faith, the embodiment of what as an abstract idea often fails to be understood; it is the epistle in flesh and blood, illustrating and parallel to the written epistle which is the doctrine in words. Men who do not heed the one often heed the other, and, when they find that the two agree, they are the more inclined to believe both. I have already spoken of the untold value of the co-operation of the laity. The Clergy are never more truly doing their proper work than when they train and equip laymen for their work of service.

(iii.) But the inner circle which I desire to see thus carefully trained in every parish for the greater extension of the Master's kingdom, must be able to give an intelligent account of the faith that is in them, and I plead for a more systematic and definite teaching of the principles of the Church of England. It is constantly said by American Bishops that emigrants from England to the United States have been often far less clearly taught by the Clergy what are the principles of the Church of England, than members of non-episcopal bodies have been taught the distinctive features of the faith that they hold. Our people should surely be taught why we are what we are, what is the distinctive character of the Church of England as compared with the Roman system on the one hand, and with the various forms of nonconformity on the other. The Providential position which she occupies, with affinities on either side and yet herself all through, may enable her one day to be a greater peacemaker than men can now realise as possible. We have nothing to be ashamed of, and nothing to apologise for, as English Churchmen. Men may misunderstand and so misrepresent us. Members of our own body may lose their balance and unduly emphasize one side of truth, exaggerating it until the type of English

ii.)—
Church of
England
principles.

Churchmanship seems hardly to be recognised. And yet there is a distinct type of Anglican Churchmanship. Hooker defended it and explained it so successfully in the reign of Elizabeth, that his masterpiece on Ecclesiastical Polity has ever since been a standard classic of English Theology. But the position needs to be continually re-stated and made plain. The Bishop of London, whom Northumberland likes to own as one of her own former sons, has in an address to his Rural Deans, delivered and published some six months ago, admirably laid down and indicated certain positions which the Church of England takes, and principles which she enshrines. The late Bishop of Grahamstown (Bishop Webb), did good service some years ago by prefixing to a little book of published addresses to candidates for ordination, a preface on principles of Anglican ritual, a very wholesome correction of some of the exaggerations to be found in parts of England to-day. Bishop Moberly's Bampton lectures on the administration of the Spirit in the Church of Christ cleared my mind more than thirty years ago, and have helped very many. The more I have studied the history of the Reformation, the more have I thanked God that, as Archbishop Benson reminded us, the leading theologians of the time were men who knew how to steer the ship safely, and no amateur pilots unaware of the shoals and the quicksands on which the ship might be wrecked. The history of our Church is a history of Providential leading since primitive days through periods of depression and decay, of reform and re-settlement, of lethargy and revival, of extension and reproduction in other parts of the world. Here in Northumberland the memories of the past are ever calling us to trust a guidance that has given us a continuous history for more than 1250 years, and in all our efforts for extension of the kingdom of our Master to make it clear that we have no shadow of doubt as to the position which He has called our Church to fill.

(iv.) The masses outside religion. How to be won.

(iv.) But as we pass from clergy and the inner circle of faithful men and women filled with the love of God, and definitely understanding the principles of the Church to which we belong, we are confronted with the fact that a large number of our people seem to live outside any distinct religion. What is our duty towards these? What does church extension among them mean? No one can go through Newcastle on a Sunday and seriously maintain that the majority of the hard-headed artizans on Tyneside are connected with any church or chapel at all. I should exaggerate if I said they were not actuated by any religious principle. I know that as rule they have had some Christian teaching in earlier life, and wish to lead upright lives as citizens, and are glad for their families to have a Christian bringing up. The world hardly realizes what the atmosphere of a Christian society means to those who live within it, though they do not seem to be *of* it. If men were transplanted to where Christian principle seems to imply no binding sanction at all, the effect of such an atmosphere would be very soon apparent. But those of whom I speak are not definitely connected with the Church of Christ at all. How are they to be won? Not, I venture to say, by merely inviting them to attend our Churches. This is often the very last way to reach their hearts at all. Many regard a Church as a suitable place for women and children, but a place with which they have no special concern. Our matchless Liturgy, so helpful to those who have been trained to understand it, makes no appeal to them. They have not learned to pray, and prayer is uncongenial and foreign to their nature. The sermon seems often not to touch their interests. To them, the Church is no home. The real thing that we need is to inspire them with a new motive, and I don't know how to put this better than by saying that by life teaching, example, as individuals, and as a society

we must help them to understand the meaning of those old words: "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son." Their whole point of view is wrong, and we who have sunlight in our religion must put things right.

The first way thereto is surely making it plain in our own life and religion that love is the spring of our faith and the inspirer of our worship. I have often thought how utterly strange those words of St. Paul must seem to many who worship in our Churches: "If all prophesy, and there come
"in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced
"of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his
"heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he
"will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."
(1 Cor. xiv. 25.)

"Falling down on his face he will worship God!" If this result of the worship of a modern congregation seems so strange, is it because the times are changed and phlegmatic Englishmen are not emotional Greeks, or is it that there is some lack of Divine love and fire in us who worship the Eternal God? I am persuaded that it is more personal loyalty to and enthusiastic love of a crucified and living Lord on our part that is needed to bring about this change. And as the love of God shews itself in love to men, we have to win those outside by a Christ-like tenderness and infinite patience. The building up all around and amongst them of a Christian society that is based on mutual love will be the concrete expression of an abstract truth, and a magnet that cannot fail in time to attract. The careful training of their children will often affect the parents. Sympathy in sorrow and sickness is another opportunity which touches in the tenderest way, and at an hour when the strongest obstacles are withdrawn. But our love must go further still. A Christ-like love overflows and shews a power to be interested in all that interests another. We shall not reach these men outside

until we have found common ground, and worked up from that. Find out what are their real interests in life, and shew that Christianity can understand and hallow them.

It is from this point of view that the ethical extension of our Lord's kingdom seems to me of the last importance. Men ought not to be able to say with any truth: "You talk of Christianity, but your attendance at Church is consistent with the most selfish class interests, with taking rents from houses not fit for human habitation, with deceptive tricks in trade, with jobbery in municipal life, with a refined selfishness into which self-sacrifice does not enter." So long as these things are true, the hindrances to persuasion are appalling. I do not mean that anything short of the actual Gospel will win to Christ, but I do mean that inconsistency between the Gospel preached and the Gospel lived is fatal to the success of even the Gospel itself, and the masses are to be won not simply by Christianity preached, but by Christianity applied. If parishioners think that our conception of Christianity is compatible with an utter indifference to what is degrading man, e.g., to intemperance, injustice, and fraud, the whole idea of religion is vitiated. The only way to win to Christ is to preach Christ, live Christ, and claim all life for Christ, keeping back no percentage which is outside the consecrated portion, and to do all this with recollection of the precept, "Be not weary in well doing." There are men who claim to be Christians but are ashamed of enthusiasm in religion, and such men must be ever strangers to the conquests of the Cross. Once win a man to the love of the Lord and he will love the house of the Lord and the day of the Lord, and will try to keep the commandments of the Lord. The first step needed is what has been called the "moral dynamic," and every effort of our life must be devoted to making it perfectly plain that God's love in Christ has touched us and consecrated all our lives.

Forgive me my brothers of the laity for speaking these plain truths, but there must be no mistake whatever as to what will win the unevangelised masses to a vital Christianity and to an appreciation of the Church to which we belong. Christianity must be taught, lived, and applied, to the *whole* life, of ourselves and of society at large and it is not clergy only who are to make this conquest. The Christian Society must be inspired with a holy love which must show itself in the consecration of life.

(v.) Let me carry this thought a step further. There is too often a graduated selfishness even in religion. One man is absorbed in individualism and seems unable to get beyond his own soul. Even admit the doctrine of neighbourhood, and yet, even then, how slowly the soul expands. There is a hyper-parochialism which is perfectly contented with realizing responsibility for the parish, and seems to have no soul for anything beyond. Another gets as far as the neighbourhood or the diocese, but can get no further. I ask you to realize that we have a responsibility as members of the Church of England for the entire Church, and that we must take our share in Church extension in the Church at large at home. The Additional Curates and Church Pastoral Aid Societies made last year forty-five grants in aid of additional clergy and a few lay workers in our diocese, amounting to £2,035 and our return to these societies was only £820. How can we be said to be taking any real and effective share in the general work of Church extension? I own that I scruple greatly to accept this generous help unless we do far more to support these great Central Societies, and there are other Home Missionary Agencies (amongst which I would class the Church of England Temperance Society) which deserve our warm support.

(vi.) But let me pass on to urge the equal claim of foreign missions. Why is it that foreign missions seem to

(v.) Our responsibility for the entire Church.

(vi.) Foreign Missions.

make no appeal whatever to a great many professing Christians? Did God the Father send His Son to live and die on the Cross? Did He tell us that eternal life was in His Son? If the realization of this makes all this difference to us, have we any right to keep it to ourselves? What would have happened if St. Aidan had never visited Northumberland and no news of Christ had ever reached this land? Surely the claim of Christ for foreign missions depends on our answer to these very simple questions, and our insensibility merely proves the dwarfdom of our own spiritual life. I ventured to express some of these thoughts in the Ramsden sermon before the University of Cambridge on Whit-Sunday, and I shall quote a part of it here. I tried to shew the gradual expansion of St. Paul's own soul from the time of his conversion to the time when flushed with the success at Ephesus, in his third missionary journey, he cried out, "After I have been there (i.e. to Jerusalem) I must also see Rome." (Acts xix. 21.)

"You will not fail to notice how gradual this power of expansion has been and what has brought it about. It is simple obedience to the command: 'Arise and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do,' which has led to this striking result. There is no evidence that we are dealing with a spiritual genius, able at a glance to forecast the future and realizing from the beginning what the end would be. There is simply a record of obedience to each Divine indication as clearly made known to a receptive but discriminating soul. St. Paul stands before us as an educated man with strongly marked individuality and profoundly penetrated with the love of Christ. He must needs go into the wilderness to realize his call, to Jerusalem to be in touch with some of the Apostles, to Tarsus to prepare for his future work, to Antioch to undertake an immediate work to which the call was plain, to Cyprus and Galatia in

obedience to a direct Divine interposition, and so with province after province until at last Rome enters into the area of his spiritual conquests. Each fresh act of obedience leads to a further vision. Each castle in the air, if so I may call it, is based upon a very real castle which has passed into his possession. There is no royal road to such a vision. Only by patient acts of obedience, by steady use of opportunities, by faithful preparation for further calls, does he at last rise to the full conception which was ever in the mind of God, but which could not but be slowly unfolded, if the conception were ever to be practically attained. You will remember our Lord's own words as to the necessary condition of apprehending spiritual truth. 'If any man *will* do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.' (John vii. 17.) Obedience to the will of God is alike necessary for the apprehension of doctrine and for the expansion of a soul. I can neither know God spiritually and apprehend the truth concerning Him, nor can I realize the nature of His Kingdom and His claims on me to extend it, unless I obey and do His will, unless—that is—I strive to do my duty according to the will of God at that stage which is immediately before me, and keep my eyes and my heart open to apprehend and realize what may be presented to me in my act of obedience.

You will observe, brethren, the two necessary corollaries which follows from this truth.

First, interest in the missionary work of the Church depends on the spirituality of our life and is a real test of it. I can no more convince an unspiritual man of the claims of the heathen world than a professor can succeed in teaching high mathematics to a man who has never mastered the elements. 'I have yet many things to say unto you,' said our Lord to His disciples on the evening before His death, 'but ye cannot hear them now.' (John xvi. 12.) As the

wisest of teachers He knew the impossibility, if the laws of human nature were to be obeyed, of attempting to teach what the spiritual powers of His disciples were then unable to grasp, and the lesson is of a permanent significance. A man's spiritual horizon must ever be widening and covering fresh ground. As he obeys he can apprehend more. The realization of the claim made on him by the non-Christian world grows just as he acknowledges the claim in what is within his reach and power. The failure to acknowledge it is simply a proof of dwarfdom in the spiritual life.

The second corollary is the unspeakable importance of our daily work, whatever it may be. Each act of obedience now, the conscientious development of each power, spiritual, intellectual, physical; the conscientious study of things called secular or of things called sacred that may be needed to mature our minds—if these be our immediate duty, then surely will they enable us hereafter to enter into the wider conceptions which God has for us in store. There is not an incident in the study of this University which may not tend to this widening of horizon and expansion of soul. There is no short cut that leads to the mountain of vision whence the prepared soul may gaze upon the kingdoms of this world as now potentially, and hereafter actually, the kingdoms of Christ. Many a man has bitterly repented in after years that he had missed opportunities, which came to him once but can never return, of mastering the ground-work which would have led to the larger conceptions that enter into his aspirations but seem beyond his grasp. Strive, brethren, to give a larger and wider meaning to the conception of Christian duty. Remember that each act of obedience enables you the better to apprehend Christian truth and to realize the claims of the kingdom of our Lord. Geographically, not less than ethically, that kingdom will only come as

we consecrate common duty, and make Christ's law the law of our common life."

If what I have written is true then the natural normal expansion of a man's soul will lead him to interest himself in Foreign Missions, and I venture very strongly to commend to the diocese the systematic support in every parish of one or other (if not both) of the two great handmaids of the Church of England in her Foreign Missionary aspect, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts and the Church Missionary Society. The latter Society has been this year keeping her hundredth anniversary, and the Centenary services and meetings—marked with profound devotion, thanksgiving, resolution, charity—have stirred up many and overflowed, so that a great stimulus has been thereby given to all Foreign Missionary effort. The elder Society, which for a century was confined to the North American colonies, though able in those colonies to attempt direct missionary work among the Red Indians, but has subsequently extended its operations to direct missionary work among the heathen not only, though primarily, in our colonies and dependencies such as India, will be keeping its 200th anniversary in 1901, and the whole year, from June 1900, will be a time of thanksgiving and fruitful effort. I sincerely trust that the diocese will respond to this call, and that there may result from the bicentenary such a stimulus to the mission work of the Church that, as now, the whole Church may get the benefit. Feeling that our own people and British dependencies abroad have the first claim on our sympathy, I hear with pleasure that the receipts from the diocese for the past year on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which alone of the two great Societies takes British colonies under its fostering care, shew a slight advance; but I cannot feel contented, and I am sure the diocese at large will gradually rise to a holy dis-

content with the measure of interest as yet taken in what the Bishops of the Anglican communion, assembled at Lambeth in 1897, termed "the work that at the present "time stands in the first rank of all the tasks we have to "fulfil." Thirteen parishes in the diocese sent no offertory last year to any society or agency for foreign missions. In the very front rank of all missionary duty comes that of intercession, and I regret to find that a day of intercession is not yet universally observed in the diocese. The Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican communion agreed to recommend the eve of St. Andrew's or some day in which the Festival falls. I find that one hundred and eleven (III) parishes either observed this day or some other locally more suitable, but I earnestly trust that every parish will come to see that this is the most important work in which parishioners can engage. One advance I record with pleasure—the institution of an annual diocesan intercession in the Cathedral on St. Andrew's Day, which began last year, on which all those who have left our diocese for the colonial or missionary fields of labour are definitely prayed for by name. I desire that the names of all such should be recorded in our Diocesan Calendar, and I trust that it will tend to promote a steady sending forth from our midst of our due share of the missionary agents abroad. I commend earnestly to the diocese the opening paragraphs of the report of the large committee of Bishops appointed at the Lambeth Conference in 1897, and the first resolution adopted by the whole body of Bishops as based upon it.

"Your Committee heartily thank Almighty God that He has kindled throughout our Communion an increasing zeal for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of souls, and that He has so abundantly blessed the efforts which have been made—a blessing granted, we doubt not, to encourage us all to far greater labours,

prayers, and self-denial. In the last ten years we note especially the great proofs of the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit, and the fitness of the Gospel for all races, which have been displayed in the newly-opened countries of Africa. Yet we see that zeal in this cause is still the enthusiasm of a few, and that the Church has yet to be far more fully aroused to recognize, as a necessary and constant element in the spiritual life of the Body and of each member of it, the fulfilment of our Lord's great commission. Our responsibility in this matter is vast and daily increasing, whether we consider the awful fact that there are still so many of our fellow-men unreached by the Gospel: or consider that so little interest has been taken in the evangelization of the Jewish race, and that so little systematic effort has been made to win the followers of Islam, although there is abundant encouragement from what has been done, and the opportunities now, especially in India, are unique; or whether we look at the great number of points at which Churches of our Communion are in local contact with heathen nations, or at the responsibilities of the British Empire in India and in the new Protectorates in Africa, or at the great fields ripening for harvest in such regions as China and Japan—China, where Western influence seems to be increasingly welcome, and where there are signs that the blood of martyrs has not been shed in vain; Japan, where, from the characteristic independence of the people, a crisis in the history of the Church seems to be imminent, and to call for the utmost care in the higher Christian education, and the training of those who are to hold office in the Church.

Your Committee have entered with some detail into the matters which have been referred to them, but they desire first to draw attention to some general considerations which cover the whole ground.

The first duty of the Church is intercession. The observance of a special day of intercession in connection with the Festival of St. Andrew appears to have led to a considerable increase in the personal offers for missionary work. Your Committee desire to urge upon the whole Church the urgent duty of making these days of intercession a reality in every diocese and every parish, and they desire to commend for the general private use the admirable noon-tide missionary prayers drawn up for the use of the Sister Church of America.

Your Committee observe with gratitude to God that a very large number of students in universities and colleges throughout the world have realized so keenly the call to missionary work that they have enrolled themselves in a Student Volunteer Missionary Union, and have taken as their watchword "The Evangelisation of the World in this Generation." A large number of these students are members of the Anglican Communion, and it seems the plain duty of that Communion to provide channels through which such newly-awakened zeal may find outlets in earnest, sound, wise work. The time seems ripe for a forward movement in the missionary campaign, and your Committee trust that one result of this Conference will be to give missionary work a far greater prominence than it has yet assumed in the minds of many churchmen.

Experience has shown the necessity of strong centres of work, the value of community missions, especially in India, the special work of the universities in touching the higher intellectual life of non-Christian nations, the value of the work of women, of medical missionaries, of industrial missions, and the importance of realising the principle, "to him that hath shall be given," if a rich harvest is to be reaped. With the accumulated experience of the last century the Church has now a great opportunity to begin

a fresh epoch with greater love for the Master and for the souls for whom He shed His blood, and with greater knowledge than ever before.

The cause of missions is the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ. May this be our aim, as it will be our highest glory, to be humble instruments in carrying out the loving will of our Heavenly Father; in lowliness of mind, praying for the Divine blessing, and confident in the Divine promises, ministering the Gospel of the Grace of God to the souls that we love; and thus, in promoting the Kingdom of Truth and Righteousness, may we fulfil the sacred mission of the Church of God, by preparing the world for the Second Advent of our Lord."

RESOLUTION.

"That while we heartily thank God for the missionary zeal which He has kindled in our Communion, and for the abundant blessing bestowed on such work as has been done, we recommend that prompt and continuous efforts be made to arouse the Church to recognise as a necessary and consistent element in the spiritual life of the Body, and of each member of it, the fulfilment of our Lord's great commission to evangelise all nations."

I have now completed the Review of the subjects which I have felt it my duty to bring before the Diocese at my primary visitation. I am fully conscious of the imperfect manner in which I have had to touch on many great subjects, and yet I trust that our conference will lead to a deeper and fuller consideration of topics which are of vital importance to the well-being of the Church. Here in Northumberland we have difficulties, opportunities, and history of our own. There is no Diocese with greater tradition. There is no Diocese that may not envy us the memories of Lindisfarne and Hexham. A great scheme for rendering Hexham Abbey worthy of its ancient history is

Conclusion

likely very soon to be submitted to the public, and I venture in anticipation to bespeak for it the heartiest support of the Diocese of which Hexham Abbey is one of the chief glories. The corporate life of the Diocese surely implies a warm interest in all that concerns every part of the entire family. We are one family in God. It is as the unworthy father of that family that I come amongst you to-day, to thank God for all that he has permitted us to do, to take account of dangers and difficulties, of weaknesses and stumbling blocks, to urge you to common action in the Diocese itself and in promoting the extension of the Master's Kingdom at home and abroad. May God bless our common labours, pardon our infirmities for the sake of Jesus Christ, "and only look on us as found in Him."

CHARGE,

DELIVERED AT THE VISITATION OF S. NICHOLAS' CATHEDRAL,
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, JUNE 6TH, 1899.

MY VENERABLE AND REVEREND BROTHERS OF THE
CHAPTER, "FRATRES EPISCOPI," AND MY BRETHREN
OF THE LAITY HOLDING OFFICE IN THIS ANCIENT
CHURCH :

I greet you in all affection on this first occasion
of holding an Episcopal Visitation of S. Nicholas' Cathedral,
and I trust that our meeting together in worship and in
conference may enable us the better to realise our corporate
life and work together for the building up of the Cathedral
system in this Diocese, at once so ancient and so young.

The revival of Episcopal Visitations after a lethargy of
a century and a half, marks emphatically the Church's
quickenened life. The late Archbishop Benson gave us, when
holding the See of Truro, a striking picture of the place of
the Cathedral in the life and work of the Church in old
days, and of the gradual decay from which God has
mercifully raised us. The records of the grand Cathedral of
Lincoln show us the great Bishop, St. Hugh, under Henry II.
"successfully resisting king and Pope in their endeavours to
"intrude persons into canonries," offering "stalls to
"suitable persons on the condition of their coming at once
"into residence, and devoting themselves to the discipline
"and preaching required of them." The Canons are
"selected for their sagacity and high character: they are in
"closest association with the Bishop. He relies on their
"advice and employs them in administration." The "new

Lincoln
Cathedr
in old da

register" of Lincoln of 1440 gives us a complete account of the activity of the Cathedral. The worship of the Diocese centred here, but yet this was the smallest part of their work. The 52 Prebendaries resided at least for one week each, but each resided chiefly on the "prebenda" which formed his endowment, and which was a centre of civilization to its district. There was no line between the Small Chapter and the Great Chapter. There was one body. Amongst them were not only theologians and preachers, but famous legists. Prebendal life was laborious. Bishop Alnwick speaks of "their daily expositions, and "constant toils, and numerous burdens." The Cathedral had its schools of architecture under "the Masters of the "Fabric;" of music under the Precentor, second in rank only to the Dean; and of grammar and of Divinity, under the Chancellor, who had charge of education, "not "for the Church only, but for the whole city," and who, to quote Dean Colet, "is bound to lecture publicly in Divinity "unto the knowledge of God and instruction of life in "morals." The Cathedral had its treasurer to administer its funds, its Archdeacons, who had jurisdiction in the seven counties connected with the Cathedral, and its Vicars who were the working staff of the Cathedral service, as the Canons were of Cathedral work. There was in theory, and at Lincoln, at least, largely in practice, a corporate life which distinguished the body, and which led to affectionate friendships, consideration of subordinates, and active work.

Now the essential feature in all this organization was that the chapter was to be "the senate of the Diocese; whose "duty is to aid the Bishop when the See is filled, to supply "his place when it is vacant." I quote again from Archbishop Benson, from whose book indeed these facts are all gleaned. "Thomassin concludes from his mass of evidence "that everywhere the clergy of Cathedral Churches formed

“one body with the Bishop, and entered into their share of the anxiety, and into some association with his sacred sway.” Van Espen says their “principal duty was to assist the Bishop by their work and their counsels, in the government of the Church.” So our own Reginald Pole—“The rationale and ground of instituting canonries and prebends in Churches was that they who are appointed to them may assist the Bishop and aid him with counsel and work in the discharge of his office and in Divine things.” The Chapter was at once a corporation subject to the Bishop’s visitation, and a council which the Bishop was bound to consult, though he was not bound by the advice tendered. The right and duty of the Bishop in visitation has from time to time been in suspense, but never languished completely till about 1725. Before the middle of the 13th century Grossteste, after a long controversy, recovered the right and asserted the principle, which had almost dropped, and from that time it was never disputed, and became the chief means of reforming abuses. “In every act and function,” I quote from Archbishop Benson, “the Dean and Chapter are subject to the visitation of the Bishop. Inasmuch as he was bound to take care that they passed nothing illegal, he could require to see the capitular acts and resolutions. Canonists have held that he cannot ordinarily visit more than twice a year. The ordinary custom up till the last century was to commence the triennial visitation of the diocese by the visitation of the Cathedral.”

Bishops
duty in
Visitation

“But the life which no convulsions checked, lethargy overpowered.” The visitation of Lincoln went on till 1724. “Diocesan councils broken up, the Provincial Council fell next. Convocation was silenced. Simultaneously with that came the cessation of Cathedral visitations, the last semblance and remnant of the Bishop’s senate. Then the palmer worm, and the

Decay.

“canker worm, and the caterpillar; the family, the
“favourite, the party. Then blank oblivion of the Covenant
“and inability to decipher it.”

From all this decay after a century and a half of lethargy, Cathedral life is now, thank God, recovering. And the most important part of the recovery is the restoration of its conciliar character. Archbishop Benson speaks of the “modern solitariness of the Bishops’ action,” and asks whether it be wise to take no steps to counteract causes “which have been reproducing in our episcopate nearly that isolation which Rome has effected for her Bishops, with the deliberate aim, in her case, of obliging them to turn for support to the Vatican.” The Royal Commission for enquiring into the condition of Cathedrals in England and Wales, in their first report, issued in 1882, wrote—“The relation in which the Bishop of the diocese stands to the Cathedral has occupied our attention, and we have endeavoured to lay down rules which shall reserve to the Bishops suitable rights and privileges, and at the same time prevent the possibility of difficult and painful questions being raised from time to time.” In their final report, issued in 1885, they add—“We have made recommendations which, as we believe, will have the effect of making the Cathedral body more helpful to the Bishop in the work of the diocese than has usually been the case in recent times.” I turn to you, my brothers of the Chapter, with the earnest desire that we, to whom in the providence of God is assigned the responsible task of building up the Cathedral system in our diocese, shall at once seize its main idea, and develop wisely and well that co-operation between Bishop and Chapter which will be one of the greatest helps in the solution of modern difficulties, and the surest guarantee for the advance of the diocese. I have spoken, in my charge to the diocese, of a true constitutional episcopacy being the right develop-

ment to meet the disquiet of the day, and I look very largely to the increase of capitular action, supplemented by the co-operation of clergy and laity, to place this authority on a constitutional basis.

Here, in Newcastle, we occupy a position unlike that of any modern See. We have no ancient Cathedral establishment, but, unlike every modern Bishopric, except Truro and Liverpool, we have a Newcastle Chapter Act, 1884, which enables us gradually to introduce the complete Cathedral system. Perhaps Truro, which has a legal Chapter already established, is the most like to Newcastle, but there the diocese has a new Cathedral, of which the Parish Church is only a small part, whereas with us the entire Church of St. Nicholas, worthy of being the Cathedral of any diocese, restored in two sections with most loving care and at a total cost exceeding £50,000, forms the entire Cathedral, and we have no desire that it should be otherwise. By the Newcastle Chapter Act, 1884, there cannot be the formation of a legal Dean and Chapter until four canonries have been established with a minimum income of £300 each, and a deanery with an income of £1000. Hereafter, at a date long distant as we all hope, a sum of £1000 per annum will be transferred from Durham, which I have always wished to devote to two stalls, and two only, with the endowment of the Archdeaconry of Northumberland. But for this purpose, if the four canonries contemplated in the Act are established—and each canonry by section 6 can be established separately, by Order in Council, without waiting for the completion of the Chapter—it is necessary that two other canonries shall be endowed by private benefaction. One of these two stalls will be, I now rejoice to think, definitely annexed to the Vicarage of Newcastle, and, as by section 6 of the Newcastle Chapter Act the Order in Council may define the duties of the Canon, I hope it may be made plain that the Canon is to be the

Newcastle
Chapter
Act.

Stall to be
Annexed
Vicarage
Newcastle

Vice-Dean of the Cathedral, the head of the Chapter in the absence of the Bishop, and, subject to the regulations already laid down and subscribed by every Honorary Canon on his collation to office, in respect of the Parish Church simply owing canonical obedience to the Bishop as his ordinary. Towards the sum of £10,000 needed for the endowment of this stall, two liberal laymen of this city, Mr. W. B. Wilkinson and Mr. John Hall, raised two years ago £3,127, now invested with the Diocesan Society, but, as I suggested, invested in such a way that the capital can be at any time transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, when it will suffice to make up a total of £10,000. I am glad to be able to report further progress in this endowment. When I was Vicar of Portsea, I was enabled to dispose of twelve acres of glebe, valuable building land, by selling it to a friendly syndicate for the purpose of realising all profits for the further endowment of the benefice. I suggested this plan to able laymen in this city, and the result has been that two, to whom the Church in this diocese is already much indebted, Mr. Ald. Gibson and Mr. Walter Scott, have purchased the eleven acres of the vicar's glebe, situated at Benwell, at the market price, and have every prospect of being able to add thereby, as profit on re-sale after paying to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the first purchase money, as I have been recently assured and am permitted to state, the sum of £3000 to the Vicar's Canonry Endowment Fund. The exact profit will be probably known before the autumn of next year, and as we are expecting at that time a visit from the Church Congress, I am anxious definitely to connect with that Congress the establishment of this first canon's stall in our Cathedral, as the last Congress in 1880 was closely connected with the final establishment of the See. I appeal therefore to the laity of the diocese, and specially to laymen connected with this city and proud of their Cathedral

church, to aid in the provision of the balance—rather less than £4000—required to complete the endowment. It is no very large sum for Tyneside to give. The generosity which has found already such noble expression in the funds for establishing this See and restoring this Cathedral, and in raising in ten years £100,000 for the Bishop of Newcastle's fund, will, I am persuaded, soon make that sum of £10,000 a completed fact.

They will do it, I am convinced, all the more readily when I make a further announcement, which I do with a gratitude to Almighty God for which I cannot easily find expression, that on the day when the sum of £10,000 is completed to endow a canonry to be attached to the Vicarage of Newcastle, another sum of £10,000 will be handed over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to endow a second stall by one who has been already a most liberal donor to the fund for establishing the Bishopric, as to every other Diocesan work—Mr. Thomas Spencer. I cannot but ask you, my friends, in the prospect of the establishment of these two residentiary canonries in the near future, and with the certainty that two others will follow, to make this service of Holy Communion in which we are engaged, to be indeed an Eucharist in which we shall offer up our praises and thanksgivings for mercies already vouchsafed. The liberality of the laity of this diocese will not end with these gifts. Knowing that the interest of £10,000 will not by itself provide all that is needed for a canon who is not to hold a benefice but to devote himself to diocesan work, I am persuaded that at least a house of residence will be provided, and, if needed, some further annual support, that we may obtain the services of as highly qualified a clergyman as is possible for the work to which he will be called.

The special functions to be assigned to the second canon will remain for future consideration. But I will men-

Endowment of
Second
Canonry
by Mr. T.
Spencer.

Suggested
functions
of Residen-
tiary
Canons.

tion certain functions which may well be discharged by residentiary canons, though I shall not attempt to place them in any special order. I have to thank you, my reverend brethren, for many excellent suggestions made in answer to my enquiries under this head.

The Royal Commission reported as follows in 1882 :—
 “ Besides the question of the services which take place in
 “ the Cathedral and matters connected with them, we have
 “ taken a wider view of the Cathedral in its relation to the
 “ whole diocese, and, indeed, to the Church at large.

“ We have considered that in many cases the members
 “ of capitular bodies might be able to make the influence of
 “ the Cathedral felt in a beneficial manner throughout the
 “ diocese by giving instruction in theological or ecclesiastical
 “ subjects, either in the Cathedral city or in suitable centres
 “ throughout the diocese; they might be able to make the
 “ same influence felt, also, by offering their services as
 “ preachers, where required; we have endeavoured to em-
 “ body this view in the statutes of those Cathedrals to
 “ which it has appeared to us to be applicable.”

The preaching power of the Cathedral and the Diocese may, by way of illustration, be thus greatly increased. A canon preaching from time to time in the Cathedral and able to go to other churches of the Diocese, sometimes for single sermons and sometimes for courses or for lectures, would be a great strength to us. A canon missionary again, who would be not merely a preacher, but at the head of the special work for reviving the spiritual life of the Diocese, and who might specially organize retreats or quiet days for clergy, parochial missions, or courses of definite teaching for building up the spiritual life in the Diocese, would again be a great blessing. Then the Chancellor of the ancient Cathedral, “ *principium et quasi fundamentum Ecclesiæ* ” as he was termed, so important an officer in charge of religious

and secular education that he was obliged to have a vice-chancellor, needs his modern counterpart now. There is no bishop and no examining chaplain who is not painfully conscious of the imperfection too often of the special preparation for the ministry. Why should it be inferior to that of a medical man? Why should a mere degree at the university, a fair test of general education, be thought sufficient, with a smattering of theology extending over some six months, and often ill digested, to qualify a young man for the most important work to which anyone could be called? I do not want any forcing, in the hot-house sense, of young men training for the ministry, still less of the moulding into one groove, or the utterance of a party Shibboleth. One noble characteristic of the late Dean Vaughan, who did such admirable work for the English Church by preparing some hundreds of young men for the ministry, attaching them to himself in warmest affection, and developing in them, with a power given to few, a sense of lofty vocation, was that he trained a young man according to his natural development, and never attempted to turn him into one uniform groove. We want a strong manly training of our young men, engendering in them an enthusiastic love of and loyalty to the one Lord, enabling them clearly to understand, and unswervingly, but in perfect charity, to teach the definite principles of the Church of England without any hankering after the uses of a foreign communion or any compromise of principle to suit the breezes of the hour. And a man who, as canon of the Cathedral, would enable our young graduates—for it is such that I desire to bring into this Diocese—to enter the ministry for work in the Diocese thus equipped for their life's service, would earn the gratitude of all the laity, and raise the standard of ministerial efficiency. Again, a Canon who, as at Exeter, might take the guidance of foreign missions under his fostering care, would be a great

blessing to the Church. Then surely our Church of England should have some endowment of research. Ought not some men to be free to study theology and Church history, and to give through books and lectures the result of their researches to those to whom God has given other work to do, but who need the study of the patient toiler that they may, with perhaps their own more practical knowledge of human nature, the better apply great thoughts worked out in patient meditation to the pressing necessities of the day.

These, my brothers, are but specimens of the distinctive service which canons residentiary, or honorary if they have the needed leisure, might do to the Church of God among us. I am convinced that God will awaken our laymen more and more to see what they may do to build up the diocese if they will give us the means of carrying such projects out.

There is one word of warning with respect to the functions of residentiary Canons, which I think it well to give. It is not wise to tie down too closely the Canon to the special duties assigned. There ought to be some dispensing power in the Bishop, for a man may well discharge certain functions for a term of years, and then be more fitted to discharge others, but provision can without much difficulty be made for this when the Canonry is established.

But I press for the conciliar idea as being, after all, the most important function of all, and it is my hope and purpose, God helping, more and more to avail myself of the counsel of my Chapter in discharging the duties of the office to which I have been called. Let us pray God to give us a holy enthusiasm to realize the blessings of this corporate life which He has given us in connection with this noble Cathedral, and this diocese so fragrant with the memories of primitive days.

It will be hardly possible for a legal Dean and Chapter of Newcastle to be formed without some amending act, somewhat, though with most important differences, after the analogy of Truro. I cannot but hope that if the functions of the Vice-Dean can be carefully guarded in an Order in Council so as to guard the rightful position of the Vicar of Newcastle as working only under the ordinary in his own parish church, it may be possible to follow the Truro precedent in a clause making the Bishop to act as Dean. If this be done a chapter will then be complete on the endowment of the four canonries.

Suggested
Amend-
ment of
the New-
castle
Chapter
Act.

But if this be done, indeed possibly by a short act in itself, I trust another anomaly may be removed, and the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne not tied inseparably to the vicarage of Eglington. It is unfair on the Bishop and the Diocese that whenever a vacancy arises in that Archdeaconry the Bishop should be obliged to look for a Clergyman with sufficient private means to afford to take Eglington, now so greatly reduced in value, and at the same time to bury in the midst of the country, seven miles from any first-class railway station, a man who is constantly needed for diocesan work. Such a severance of Archdeaconry and benefice can only be done by Act of Parliament, as I am advised by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and it must be done if we are to be free to do our work in the most efficient way.

I am anxious, however, to inspire, if I may, every Clergyman and layman connected with this Cathedral with the responsibility and privilege that rest on him to make the Cathedral system as efficient and as full of blessing as he can. What post can be more important than that of Churchwarden to such a Church? I rejoice, gentlemen, that you have a prospect of raising a far larger sum of money, by a judicious use of land vested in you under the authority of the Charity Commissioners, for the benefit of

Responsi-
bility of all
connected
with the
Cathedral.

Church-
wardens.

this Church and the keeping up of its services. And yet, I must say that I think this Cathedral should not hesitate to appeal to the whole Diocese for whatever is needed to make it really the mother Church of the Diocese, and the centre of its spiritual life. The "Cathedral Service Maintenance Fund," referred to in one of the regulations concerning honorary Canons, appears to me to be little more than a name.

Clergy,
Organist,
Choir,
Vergers.

What service can be offered of greater value to a congregation than the reverent rendering by Clergy, Organist, and Choir, of a dignified Cathedral service? "Due praises humbly paid (to quote from the Regula "Canonicorum, A.D. 816) with such sweetness of reading "and of melody as shall comfort the learned and educate "the ignorant. Their purpose for people's edification rather "than empty pleasingness." Should not the mother Church always set the standard of reverent and real devotion, of stately worship without a tinge of formalism, of true Church of England principles in utterance, and symbol, and prayer, which may make our people bless God increasingly for the great heritage given to us in England's Church? I thank God for all that this Cathedral already does. It sets a noble example to the Diocese. It is the home of devotion. Its daily offices and daily communions are offerings of worship not for the parish or the city alone. Its monthly intercession, its courses of Lenten and Advent teaching, its now annual service on St. Andrew's Day, with intercession for all our diocesan representatives in the mission field abroad, its faithful ministries, have been blessed, I am assured, for years to thirsting souls. I long to see all this developed as we have the means. Some day we may perhaps have our daily choral evensong, and may have our Diocesan choral festivals, and men and women will increasingly say, "I was glad when they said unto me: we will go into the

“House of the Lord.” We may all take our part in thus making the Cathedral life to bear on the life of the whole Diocese—Bishop, Chapter, Clergy, Churchwardens, Organist, Choir down to the youngest Chorister, Vergers,—surely to be connected at all with such a building is an honour and a privilege.

I cannot count the honour of a stall in such a Church to be simply, or even chiefly, in its reference to the past or as a recognition of past labour. It is all this, but it is far more. Its chief characteristic is that it brings a man into the corporate life of the Diocese at its centre, places him at once in the Bishop’s council, and claims from him a share of the Diocesan work. The Royal Commissioners have drawn out this point by inserting in the proposed new statutes of the Cathedrals of Carlisle, Chester, Winchester, and Worcester, a clause: “Residence within the diocese shall be a condition of holding an Honorary Canonry, except in cases in which a dispensation shall be granted by the Bishop,” and I am strongly convinced, as my predecessor was, that the principle is a right one if our Cathedrals are to be what they may be to the several Dioceses. I have, after consulting the Archbishop of the Province, and following his grace’s own custom when Bishop of Lichfield and the similar uses of Salisbury, Southwell, and Wakefield, and various other Cathedrals, made subscription to a similar proviso to be a condition of acceptance of any Honorary Canonry which I have offered.

To-day the sad news has reached us of the death of a much-loved member of our body in ripe old age, Canon John Mason Mason, Rector of Whitfield. Each such call is a warning to work while it is day. May we, my brothers, rise more and more to a sense of the dignity of the calling wherewith Christ has called us, and with one consent

Leading
idea of
Hon.
Canonry.

Residence
of Hon.
Canons
within the
Diocese.

Death of
Canon
Mason.

resolve on our knees that by the intensity of our devotion, the energy of our work, the harmony of our efforts, we shall make this Cathedral witness to the unity of the Diocese, the unity of the Church, and the Trinity in unity of the Eternal God.

APPENDIX I.

CONVOCAATION OF YORK.

UPPER HOUSE.

**Report of the Committee on the Fasting Reception
of the Holy Communion.***Adopted unanimously by the House, May 4th, 1899.*

Our attention has been called to the teaching of various Manuals of Instruction and Devotion which are widely circulated among members of our Church, and to special pastoral directions, in which Fasting Reception is made one of the things "required of them who come to the Lord's Supper," though it is not included in the requirements set out in the Catechism, and nowhere enjoined in the Prayer Book or in any authoritative document of our Church.

We are very far from desiring to lessen in any degree the devout reverence with which the Sacrament of Holy Communion ought to be approached; or to discourage Fasting Reception where it is found to provide a salutary self-discipline. We readily acknowledge that a custom which has prevailed from early times throughout the Church generally till the sixteenth century, and which has been advocated as helpful to the spiritual life by many teachers of our own Church, is always likely to find wide acceptance among us. At the same time to describe reception without fasting as a sin* is wholly unwarranted by the teaching of Holy Scripture, and is therefore inconsistent with the Ordination Vow. We further hold that there are grave reasons both from the history of the custom and from its essential character against making the practice of Fasting Reception one of obligation.

1. The circumstances of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist exclude the thought that taking food shortly before disqualifies

*See the Report on Fasting Communion adopted by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, May 5th, 1893. Clause 8. "That, regard being had to the practice of the Apostolic Church in this matter, to teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting, is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church of England."

for Reception. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's treatment of this Sacrament in 1 Cor. xi. Nor is the obligation of Fasting Reception supported by any authority of Scripture or by any apostolic ordinance. The conjecture of Augustine that it was one of the points which St. Paul "set in order" (1 Cor. xi. 24) rests on no historical foundation.

The custom of Fasting Reception would naturally arise when the service was transferred from a late hour in the evening (according to our reckoning) to an early hour in the morning. The cause of this change is not recorded. It may have been made in the Gentile Churches, in which the Jewish reckoning of time was superseded by the Roman, in order to place the service at the beginning of the Roman day, as the institution had been at the beginning of the Jewish day. But not to insist on any special explanation of the origin of the change, it is enough to observe that there is no reason for supposing that it was made in order to secure a fast from the beginning of the day to the time of Communion.

When the custom of Fasting Reception was once established even in a limited range, it was likely to spread owing to the general tendency of the Oriental mind towards ascetic practices.* But the adoption of the custom was ultimately accompanied by serious evils. Infrequent reception and non-communicating attendance, which cannot be wholly dissociated from Fasting Communion, came to be general; and these customs find no support in the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church.

2. Fasting, again, is a means to an end and not an end in itself. It is valuable or not according as it fulfils the proposed object. It may be employed to obtain for the communicant the fullest command over his powers of attention and devotion. But it is evident that the fitness of fasting for obtaining this result depends in a large degree upon climate, domestic habits, age and the like; and exhaustion, as we all know, is itself in most cases

*Consider *e.g.* the interpolation of the word "fasting" in later editions of the New Testament. In 1 Cor. vii. 5, "fasting" is certainly not a part of the original text. In Mark ix. 29, it is probably an interpolation. While the whole verse Matt xvii. 21, is probably an interpolation based upon the later reading of Mark ix. 29.

fatal to spiritual self-command. And more than this: while the spontaneous combination of prayer and fasting corresponds with a spiritual instinct, it is contrary to the tenor of apostolic teaching, and indeed of the teaching of the Lord Himself, to make the observance of a period of material abstinence a necessary condition of participating in the highest spiritual service of the church. The inherent discordance between the custom of Fasting Reception and its object becomes still more obvious, if fasting is made obligatory from a fixed hour, when it is remembered that the duration of the fast and its physical effects will necessarily vary in individual cases, and are practically indeterminate. Nor can it be overlooked that the different conditions of town and country parishes introduce serious difficulties in the uniform application of any such rule. It may be added that so far as Fasting Reception is advocated on the ground of reverence for the Sacrament, the arguments have a wider range. They may be used with equal, and some will think with greater, force in favour of fasting after reception.

Such considerations shew that Fasting Reception is one of those matters of Ecclesiastical Discipline which every "particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish" with a view to the spiritual health of its members. And that the English Church since the Reformation has ceased to require fasting before Holy Communion, leaving the matter to individual liberty,* appears to be clear from the fact that there is no direction upon the subject in those passages of the Prayer Book in which the requisites of individual preparation are plainly specified, nor in any of our authoritative documents. If it be urged that there was no need to prescribe the observance in 1549, the same cannot be said of 1662.† In other words our Church

†See e.g. St. Mark vii 15. "There is nothing from without a man, that, entering into him, can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man."

*See the Report on Fasting Communion adopted by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, May 5th, 1893. Clause 7. "That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in Article xxxiv., ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is commended by several of our eminent writers and divines down to the present time."

†Compare the first Rubric of the Service for Baptism of those of Riper Years, in which Fasting is recommended (1662).

has virtually applied to this matter the principle of St. Paul's teaching on a similar question : *Let not him that eateth set at nought him that eateth not ; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth ; for God hath received him Let each man be fully assured in his own mind* (Rom. xiv. 3, 5).

The following *gravamen* (1892), signed by members of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, gave rise to the Report of the Upper House of that Convocation (1893), to which reference is made in the foregoing Report.

The *gravamen* of the undersigned sheweth—

1. That whereas it is admitted by all who have studied the subject that from early times it was the custom among Christians to communicate fasting, and that this custom has been followed by many godly persons in the Church of England subsequently to the Reformation ;

2. And whereas the said Church of England has nowhere in her authorised formularies, articles, canons, or homilies inculcated or recommended the said practice ;

3. And whereas Holy Scripture is altogether silent upon this subject, albeit it censures other profanations of the Holy Sacrament ;

4. And whereas the Church of England expressly lays down in the Sixth Article that whatsoever is not read in Holy Scripture nor may be proved thereby is not to be thought requisite or necessary to salvation ; and again in the Twentieth Article affirms that the Church ought not, beside the same (Scripture) to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation ;

5. And whereas the Church of England exacts from all Priests at their ordination a promise that they will teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which they shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture ;

6. And whereas the undersigned is credibly informed that certain Priests of the Church of England do now teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting ;

7. And whereas this teaching is a burden to the conscience and cause of distress to many Christian people ;

Reformandum.—That their lordships of the Upper House be humbly prayed to take such steps as they may in their wisdom deem best on this grave matter with a view to allaying the present distress and perplexity.

JOHN MITCHINSON (Bishop), Archdeacon of Leicester.

P. F. ELIOT, Dean of Windsor.

W. F. JOHN KAYE, Archdeacon of Lincoln.

EDWIN PALMER, Archdeacon of Oxford.

B. F. SMITH, Archdeacon of Maidstone.

J. W. SHERINGHAM, Archdeacon of Gloucester.

ROBERT GREGORY, Dean of St. Paul's.

G. D. BOYLE, Dean of Salisbury.

ALEXANDER COLVIN AINSLIE, Proctor for Clergy of Bath and Wells.

G. R. DOVER, Archdeacon of Canterbury.

F. W. FARRAR, Archdeacon of Westminster.

CON. FRERE, Proctor for Archdeaconry of Suffolk.

- R. P. LIGHTFOOT, Archdeacon of Oakham.
 CHARLES BURNEY, Archdeacon of Kingston.
 THOMAS WALTERS, Proctor for St. David's Diocese.
 E. ARTHUR SALMON, Proctor for Clergy of Bath and Wells.
 W. W. DOUGLAS, Proctor for Clergy of Worcester.
 W. WALTERS, Archdeacon of Worcester.
 J. M. NISBET, Canon for Chapter of Norwich.
 W. J. LAWRENCE, Archdeacon of St. Alban's.
 EDWARD T. VAUGHAN, Proctor for Clergy of St. Alban's.
 J. HENRY FREER, Archdeacon of Derby.
 CHARLES J. HAMILTON, Proctor for Clergy of Southwell.
 ERNALD LANE, Archdeacon of Stoke-on-Trent.
 JOHN C. McDONNELL, Proctor for Chapter of Peterborough.
 C. T. WILKINSON, Archdeacon of Totnes.
 H. R. HAYWARD, Archdeacon of Cirencester.
 E. OWEN PHILLIPS, Chancellor of St. David's Cathedral, Proctor
 for Chapter.
 J. OWEN, Dean of St. Asaph.
 BROUGH MALTBY, Archdeacon of Nottingham.
 H. FRANK JOHNSON, Archdeacon of Essex.
 H. A. JEFFREYS, Proctor for the Clergy of Canterbury.
 JOHN PUCKLE, Proctor for the Clergy of Canterbury.
 VERNON MUSGRAVE, Proctor for Archdeaconry of Surrey.
 WILLIAM WARBURTON, Proctor for Chapter of Winchester.
 H. HAIGH, Archdeacon of the Isle of Wight.
 F. V. MATHER, Proctor for the Clergy of the diocese of Gloucester
 and Bristol.
 ELDON S. BANKES, Proctor for the Clergy of the diocese of Salisbury.
 JOHN R. CORNISH, Archdeacon of Cornwall.
 T. B. BUCHANAN, Archdeacon of Wiltshire.
 R. S. HUTCHINGS, Proctor for the Clergy of the diocese of Salisbury.
 ARTHUR J. INGRAM, Proctor for the Clergy of the diocese of London.
 CHARLES S. PALMER, Proctor for the Clergy of the diocese of Hereford.
 A. COLCHESTER, Archdeacon of Colchester.
 FREDERICK BATHURST, Archdeacon of Bedford.
 WILLIAM BREE, Archdeacon of Coventry.
 BERKELEY L. STANHOPE, Archdeacon of Hereford.
 REGINALD HOBHOUSE, Archdeacon of Bodmin.
 FREDERICK J. WILSON, Proctor for the Clergy of Truro.
 P. GOLDSMITH MEDD, Clergy Proctor, Gloucester and Bristol.
 GEORGE PERRY, Clergy Proctor for Lincoln diocese.
 GEORGE HERBERT, Dean of Hereford.
 M. F. SADLER, Proctor for diocese of Exeter.
 HENRY BAILEY, Proctor for the Archdeaconry of Chichester.
 CAREY H. BORROR, Proctor for the Archdeaconry of Lewes.

APPENDIX II.

READ AND OTHERS v. THE LORD BISHOP
OF LINCOLN.

EXTRACTS FROM JUDGMENT, NOVEMBER 21ST, 1890.

I. MIXING WATER WITH THE WINE.

The Court concludes:—

I. The Church of England has, and in the 34th article declares itself to have, the same authority as any Church Western or Eastern “to ordain change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man’s authority.” By and within this authority the mixing of the cup was removed from the place it had before held in the public service of the Church. It was so removed in accordance with antient, primitive and very general use of most Churches. To practise it as if it had not been removed is to disregard those precedents and this authority.

2. ADMINISTERING THE MIXED CHALICE.

II. No rule has been made to “change or abolish” the all but universal use of a mixed cup from the beginning. When it was desirable to modify the direction as to the uniform use of unleavened wafers, a Rubric was enacted declaring Wheat Bread sufficient. Without order it seems that no person had a right to change the matter in the Chalice, any more than to change the form of Bread. Wine alone may have been adopted by general habit but not by law. No rule having been made, it is not within the competency of this Court to make a new rule, in fact a Rubric; which it would do if it ordered that a mixed cup should not be used.

The Court decides that the mixing of the Wine in and as part of the Service is against the law of the Church, but finds no

ground for pronouncing the use of a cup mixed beforehand to be an ecclesiastical offence.

3. ABLUTION.

The Rubric gives a general direction as to what is to be done in the way of consuming what remains after the service, and is not so minute as to go beyond this, our Book having abandoned many over-niceties of regulation. If a conscientious scruple is felt as to not "carrying out of the church" slight remnants even into the vestry, it is not the duty of this Court to override it, and the Credence is a suitable place for completing the consumption. In antient liturgies, which cannot be held to fail in punctilious reverence, after the words of dismissal the Minister goes into the *prothesis* (the side apse where the Credence is) and there consumes the last remnants (see Goar, *Euch.*, p. 86). In neither of those liturgies, which were in Cranmer's hands and used by him (as we have seen), are any directions given. If it were the duty of this Court to point out where and when, if not at the Holy Table, the Minister would most properly complete the consumption of the consecrated elements in such way as he might think to be necessary in compliance with the Rubric, the Court would unhesitatingly say At the Credence, or in the place where they had been prepared. Nevertheless the Court cannot hold that the Minister, who, after the Service was ended and the Benediction given, in order that no part of the consecrated elements should be carried out of the church, cleansed the vessels of all remnants in a reverent way without Ceremony or Prayers before finally leaving the Holy Table, would have subjected himself to penal consequences by so doing.

In this case, it would have been illegal to vary the service by making "the Ceremony of Ablution" charged in the articles, or the like, appear to be part of it, but the evidence does not shew that this was done.

This charge must be dismissed.

4. EASTWARD POSITION IN THE FIRST PART OF THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

The Court concludes.

The term North side was introduced into a Rubric of the Liturgy to meet doubts which had arisen owing to a general change in the position of the Holy Tables. It was at that time perfectly definite and distinct in its meaning and application.

About eighty years after the first publication of that Rubric a second general change was made under authority in the position of the Tables, which were now moved to the East end.

This change made the North side direction impossible of fulfilment in the sense originally intended. The new interpretation or usage commonly adopted was not prescribed by any statute or authoritative declaration. The evidence of the Visitation Articles has been already adduced, and it has been shown that the grounds which the liturgical commentators took in its defence were mistaken. On the other hand there are indications that a different interpretation, though probably small in its range, was not unfamiliar in the Church.

It will be observed that the argument under this head is of a cumulative character, and that no point of the evidence is conclusive when isolated. It is the concurrence and coincidence of such indications as have been referred to that gives them force. It is possible that further research or argument may hereafter throw additional and perhaps novel light upon this somewhat obscure subject, devoid as it is of doctrinal interest.

So far then as the information before the Court extends the Court is of opinion that a certain liberty in the application of the term existed—a liberty exercised not without consideration. This liberty was less and less exercised for a long time, but it does not appear to be lost by that fact or taken away.

Such existing liberty it is not the function of a Court, but only of legislation, to curtail. And the duty of the Court is not to consider one word only as it stands, but to have regard both to the original meaning and to the history of the term.

It would be virtually attempting to make a new Rubric if it were judicially to attach a secondary meaning, whencesoever derived or inferred, to the definite, primary term, and to declare under penal consequences that what has never been set forth as the only possible form of obedience to the Rubric under present conditions is alone admissible.

The Court is however distinctly called upon to state—the point having been urged with a view to guiding its judgment—that none of the alternative positions which have been mentioned as adopted by different authorities in accommodating this Rubric to the present situation of the Holy Table convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine.

In order to make the act described an illegal act it would be necessary to prove that no interpretation or accommodation of the term 'North side' except 'North end' was correct in point of language, and that the position at the North end had been required by at least some authority since the last Revision, and that no other had been practically permitted. This is not proved.

It is necessary, therefore, that the charge, presumably intended to be brought against the Lord Bishop in the ninth article, should be dismissed, although not on the ground alleged in the Responsive plea.

5. BREAKING OF THE BREAD BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

The Court decides that the Order of the Holy Communion requires that the Manual Acts should be visible.

II. The second question before the Court was Whether the Order of the Holy Communion requiring that the Manual Acts should be visible, the hiding of the Acts without the wish or intention to hide them constitutes a transgression of that order: in other words, Whether such being the requirement of that Order, it is a sufficient answer to a charge that they have been rendered invisible, to reply that there was no wish or intention to prevent their being seen.

The Court decides that in the mind of a Minister there ought to be a wish and intention to do what has to be done, not

merely no wish or intention not to do it; that in this case he must not hide the acts by doing what must hide them; that he must not be so indifferent as to what the result of what he does may be as to do that which is certain to make them invisible.

The Court therefore, reviewing the plea, rules that the Lord Bishop has mistaken the true interpretation of the Order of the Holy Communion in this particular, and that the Manual Acts must be performed in such wise as to be visible to the Communicants properly placed.

6. SINGING OF THE ANTHEM, "O LAMB OF GOD."

Seeing, then, that there is no evidence whatever to show that Bishop Ridley or any one else objected to the Choir singing this Anthem at this place upon any doctrinal ground, and seeing that the Act of Parliament which established the Second Book lays down expressly that the First Book was "agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church;" and seeing also that the typical Protestant Representatives at the Savoy desired the restoration at this very place of the words in still stronger form, there is no ground left for believing that the words had then, or have now, any association with those Roman doctrines or practices which the Church of England repudiates.

Under these circumstances, although we might readily agree that the proximity of two other repetitions of the words in the Litany and *Gloria* may make them not the aptest anthem for use here and may suggest their disuse, as apparently it did to the framers of the Second Book, the Court has not to consider expediency but legality. That use of them could only be condemned on the ground that any and every hymn at this place would be illegal, which cannot be maintained in the face of concurrent, continuous, and sanctioned usage. To condemn the singing of that text here as unsound in doctrine would be contrary to the real force of Ridley's injunction, and to other unexceptionable Protestant teaching.

The Court concludes that the singing of it by the choir was not an illegal addition to the service.

7. LIGHTS.

It would be contrary to the history and interpretation of the two lights on the Holy Table to connect them with erroneous and strange teaching as to the nature of the Sacrament. It is not likely that they will cease to be distasteful to many minds, and where that is the case, even in a small degree, charity and good sense ought not to be violated.

The lawfulness of lighting the candles in the course of the Service is not before us. But the Court does not find sufficient warrant for declaring that the law is broken by the mere fact of two lighted candles, when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, standing on the Holy Table continuously through the Service; nothing having been performed or done, which comes under the definition of a Ceremony, by the presence of two still lights alight before it begins and until after it ends.

8. THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN THE ABSOLUTION.

Thus there is no ground to allege that to make the sign of the Cross at the Absolution in the Communion Service is in any sense a continuance of old prescription in the Church of England, or a compliance with prescription which could historically affect our service.

This Ceremony is an innovation which must be discontinued.

9. THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN THE BENEDICTION.

The Court therefore finds that there is no justification either in direction or usage for making the sign of the Cross in giving the final Benediction; that the action is a distinct ceremony, not 'retained,' since it had not previously existed; and that therefore it is a ceremony additional to the ceremonies of the Church 'according to the Use of the Church of England' (*Title c. p. b.*).

This ceremony also is an innovation which must be discontinued.



